

RASHTRAPATI BHAVAN
LIBRARY



Reg. No. 1372


Clas. No. III - 13



RECOLLECTIONS OF A LONG LIFE

Es ist eine alte Geschichte
Doch bleibt es immer treu.

HEINE.



EARL GREY.

From the picture by Sir Thomas Lawrence, P.R.A., in the National Portrait Gallery.

[Frontispiece.

RECOLLECTIONS OF A LONG LIFE

BY LORD BROUGHTON
(JOHN CAM HOBHOUSE)

WITH ADDITIONAL EXTRACTS
FROM HIS PRIVATE DIARIES

EDITED BY HIS DAUGHTER
LADY DORCHESTER



WITH PORTRAITS. IN FOUR VOLUMES

VOL. IV. 1829—1834

LONDON

PRINTED BY
HAZELL, WATSON AND VINEY, LD.,
LONDON AND AYLESBURY.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER IX

Duke and Duchess of Clarence—Continental Opinion of Wellington—Allan Cunningham—The Byron Copyrights—Moore's Life—Death of George Tierney—O'Connell's Parliamentary Value—Unopened American Despatches—Funeral of Douglas Kinnaird—David Wilkie—Ugo Foscolo—Jewish Disabilities Bill—The Byron Separation—Buonaparte at St. Helena—"His Majesty's Opposition"—Fanny Kemble as Juliet—Thomas Campbell—Samuel Rogers—Sermon by Sydney Smith—Joseph Hume and Middlesex—Death of George IV.—The New King—The Regency Question—The Revolution of July—Accession of Louis Philippe—Galt's Life of Byron—The King at Brighton—Death of Mr. Huskisson pp. 1-50

CHAPTER X

Charles X.—The Struggle in Belgium—Trouble in the City—Vanderweyer and Wellington—Sir Edward Codrington—End of the Wellington Ministry—The New Government—Lord Chancellor Brougham—At Holland House—Alarm at Paris—Moore's Life of Byron—A Day of Fasting—Reform Bill introduced—Lord Grey—Rejection defeated—Count Walewski pp. 51-99

CHAPTER XI

Excitement in Parliament—Misunderstanding with Peel—Westminster Dinner—Lady Julia Hobhouse ill—The Second Reform Bill—Paganini—Opening of London Bridge—Death of Sir Benjamin Hobhouse—Social Reform Bills carried pp. 100-137

CHAPTER XII

Democratic Excitement—Anti-Reform Successes—The National Union—Lord John Russell's New Bill—Macaulay and Croker—A Handsome Majority—The Hothams—T. P. Cooke—"God Almighty's Aristocracy"—Secretary-at-War—Kissing Hands as Minister—Uncontested Re-election—Proposals to create Peers—The Garrick Club—The King's First Levee—Lord Althorp's Dilemma—Dangers from Birmingham—Flogging in the Army pp. 138-200

CHAPTER XIII

Audience with the King—James Hogg—Lady Holland—Depressed—The Princess Victoria—Prince Czartoryski—Reform Bill in the Lords—Second Reading carried—Tales of Lord Townshend—Crisis Day—Meeting at Brooks's—The New Government—Baring and Wellington—Opposition of the Lords—Guarantees secured—Progress of the Reform Bill—The Duke of Sussex—The King's Anger—Revolution in Paris—Unpopularity of the King and Queen—Chelsea Hospital—The Flogging Question—Farewell of the Speaker—Prorogation of Parliament pp. 201-251

CHAPTER XIV

Nelson and Bobbing—An Efficient War Office—Statesmen of the Day—Lord Durham—Re-elected for Westminster—Army Reforms—The House and Window Tax—Emancipation of Slaves—Nahmek Pasha—Mehemet Ali—Election of Sutton as Speaker—"The Bird of Prey"—Irish Church Reform—Military Reductions—Ministerial Troubles—Sinecures and Economy—The Irish Coercion Bill—A Deadlock—Lord Goderich's Reluctance to resign—At the Irish Office—Debate on Currency—Resignation—Re-nominated for Westminster—Defeated pp. 252-313

CHAPTER XV

The Duchess of Kent—Aspects of Wellington—Illness of Lady Julia—At Lord Harrington's—The Zoological Gardens—Basildon Park—

Macaulay—Ada Byron—Procession of Trades Unions—Lady Holland's Testimony—Affairs in France—At the Duchess of Kent's—O'Connell and Ireland—No Canvass or Pledges—Trouble in the Cabinet—New Appointments—Conversation with Lord Tavistock—Quarrel between Ellice and Durham—Resignation of Lord Grey—Minister for Woods and Forests—Elected for Nottingham—In the Cabinet—The Ministerial Fish-dinner—The King and the People. . . . pp. 314-363

APPENDIX

Table of Administrations during the Period covered by these Volumes pp. 364-365

INDEX pp. 367-383

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

EARL GREY	<i>Frontispiece</i>
From the picture by Sir Thomas Lawrence, P.R.A., in the National Portrait Gallery.	
	FACING PAGE
ELIZABETH, THIRD LADY HOLLAND	75
From the picture by Robert Fagan at Holland House. By kind permission of Mary, Countess of Ilchester.	
LORD ALTHORP	181
John Charles, Third Earl Spencer (Viscount Althorp). By Sir G. Hayter. By kind permission of his nephew, Viscount Althorp, to Lady Dorchester.	
SIR FRANCIS BURDETT (Photogravure)	248
From a picture in the possession of Lady Dorchester.	

RECOLLECTIONS OF A LONG LIFE

CHAPTER IX

FROM DIARY.

October 16.—I dined with Burdett at Cambridge House, Richmond, and was introduced for the first time to the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. 1829.

The Duke seems to be fond of appearing to know something about everybody and everything. He said to me, "You were at Oxford"; and talking to W. Penn about a Miss Wauchope said, "She was the daughter of a General." "Not at all, Sir," replied Penn; "she was the daughter of a cheesemonger."

On the whole he is quite a Prince: a great asker of questions about nothing. His Duchess a pleasing, amiable-mannered woman.

November 7.—Walked to Lincoln's Inn. Saw Bickersteth and Seton. The latter just where I left him many years ago, the same small room, no sign of progress in his profession. Yet here is a clever man, a college prizeman, an excellent scholar, a painstaking person, surpassed by hundreds of inferior capacity. Is it for want of luck or self-confidence?

1829, *November 9.*—Dined at H. Stephenson's. Met there amongst others my old lackadaisical, excellent friend, Robert Adair. He told of Pozzo di Borgo that at one time he was proscribed by three Emperors—Napoleon, Francis, Alexander—and had no way of escape but getting a Turkish firman, which Adair procured for him, and he broke through the Transylvanian frontier. Afterwards when the French and Russians made war he went round by Torneo, and contrived to see Alexander. From that moment his fortune was made. He lost his little patrimony in Corsica by adhering to the English when they were masters there, and got his pension from us on that account.

November 16.—Lord Tweeddale told me he had been walking with the Duke of Wellington, who said the Government were quite strong in both Houses. He asked Tweeddale what they said of him on the Continent. Tweeddale replied, "Sir, they say you have sunk England to be a third-rate power." "Ah, do they?" said the Duke. "But," added Tweeddale, "they complain that you have forced Polignac into the Ministry, and have saved Constantinople, which is not consistent with your degradation of England." The Duke laughed and said, "Aye, aye, all is right."

November 20.—The sub-committee of the Byron Monument met, and agreed to accept Thorwaldsen's offer of £1,000 for the Byron statue.

I have offered to say that I think Mrs. Leigh may part with some of her MSS. to Murray, to

assist Moore in his *Life of Byron*. This is better than publishing them herself by means of her son-in-law, Trevanion, and as she wants the money very much perhaps she may be justified, but the necessity is a grievous one. 1829.

November 21.—Dined at the S.S.B.S. Brougham brought me home and said, "Well, what do you think of politics? We should oppose these people, eh?" I said I did not see for what, and that the only fault I found was that the Duke of Wellington had inferior associates where he might have the best men in the country.

November 24.—Dined at Colonel Hugh Baillie's, where I met Allan Cunningham, the author of "*Lives of British Painters*." He told me of a Scotsman who admired Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, and *Julius Cæsar*, and *Lear*, but added, "How could he write such nonsense as *The Tempest* and *Midsummer Night's Dream*!"

I complimented him on the liberal tone of his "*Lives*." He said he never would give it up, although he knew he was suspected of being too free in his opinions. Indeed, a Cabinet Minister told him, "he would do very well if he would steer clear of that rock."

In this way the literature of the country is poisoned at its source. The moment a writer of talent gets into good company he is told that he must beware of unfashionable opinions, in other words he must adopt the cant of the age.

December 21.—This day came on the trials for

1829. libel against Alexander, editor of the *Morning Journal*. The Chancellor gained his verdict easily, and deserved it. Alexander pleaded his own cause very badly, in every sense of the word.

Lord Tenterden was fair in summing up, and though his feelings would naturally prompt him to spare an Anticatholic and an Anticopleyite, yet he pronounced the charge made by the *Journal* against the Chancellor to come within the scope of indictment to the full extent.

December 22.—This day the editor was tried for libelling the King and his Ministers. The jury found him guilty of the first, but not of the second. The *Times* takes a decided part against the Ministry in these prosecutions (not that of the Chancellor), and so I think will every unprejudiced man. They are unworthy of the Duke of Wellington, and will injure his Government.

1830. *January 5, 1830.*—I called on Hanson and agreed with him that I should speak to some publisher about offering the unsold copyrights of Byron at a trade sale.

Hanson actually contemplates writing a *Life of Byron*, particularly from eight to eighteen, which he says was the most interesting part of his existence.

January 14.—Murray has sent Moore's book to me as a present from the publisher. I see two or three inaccuracies at once, but am struck with the information collected as to Lord Byron's early

days. I doubt the fact of his scepticism in those early days on religious subjects. 1830.

I called on Murray and told him what I thought of the book. "Aye," replied Murray; "well, let Lady Julia read it and hear her opinion." This I took to be a clever mode of letting me know the book is written for the women.

January 15.—I find Moore has managed with much adroitness to make such mention of me as I can hardly quarrel with even, although the general result is rather unsatisfactory than otherwise. As to Byron's character, he has, on the whole, portrayed it fairly. The most unjust of his conclusions is that Byron's singularities, both in conduct and opinion, are chiefly to be ascribed to his college associates. Certainly Byron had nothing to learn when he came from Harrow; nor were his Southwell recreations such as Moore pretends them to have been.

I saw Hanson, who is also struck with Moore's information.

January 23.—I had a party to dine with me. R. Gordon amused us much by telling stories of France, and complaining of the Duke's Government at home and the apostasy, as he calls it, of the Opposition.

He seems to think the fall of Charles X. inevitable, unless he gives up the obnoxious Ministry. The Duke of Orleans bids fair for the Crown.

For myself I have no faith in French political foresight nor any liking for French politicians,

1830. I have seen too much of them. Gordon thinks we are ruined at home for want of one-pound notes, and does not believe the Duke can meet Parliament without some change.

January 28.—George Tierney died suddenly on Monday last. The panegyrics in the newspapers seem to me true as to his Parliamentary capacity, but false as to his integrity. My father, who knew him well, told me he was as great an intriguer as ever lived. I also think that no statesman ever took such false views of coming events as G. Tierney. His conjectures, so far as I ever heard of them, were never happy.

January 30.—I dined at Brougham's, who was as usual most pleasing and instructive, without pedantry or presumption of any kind.

He told us in proof of the vanity of the newspaper reporters that when he contrived to save one Collier, of the *Times*, from being sent to Newgate by the House of Commons, he happened to call the man "the person at the Bar." For this offence, though he had rescued the reporter, he was *cushioned* by the gallery press for more than a fortnight.

Another time he incurred the displeasure of the same powerful body by using the expression "a poor printer or reporter," as if the two were on a par. Brougham had a letter from the same Collier on the subject, and wrote an explanation to Mackintosh, which Sir James was to hand to the offended parties.

Brougham advised that no effort should be made against the Government, and he said, "Let us be quite sure, before we turn the Duke out, whom we shall turn in after him." 1830.

Brougham also told us of the King's remark, when Mr. Canning showed him the letter in which he (Brougham) had offered to support the Government without office. "Does not your Majesty think that very magnanimous?" "Very magnanimous," said the King; adding, soon afterwards, "Take him at his word."

Brougham said the King was highly offended at a paragraph about his not paying the Duke of York's debts which appeared in the *Times*. So angry was he that he almost quarrelled with Wellington. A Sunday newspaper imputed the paragraph to Brougham. Brougham saw T. Barnes and told him to contradict it, for, said Brougham, "I never contradict anything myself." Query, what is to become of this extraordinary man?

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

Parliament met on February 4. The Royal Speech confined the distress to some parts of the country, but Knatchbull moved an amendment which spread the distress over the whole country. Huskisson, who with his party were in battle-array in their old places below the gangway, concluded his speech by declaring he should vote for the amendment. Althorp also declared he

1830. should vote for the amendment, and Brougham took the same line, adding, however, that "he would not do so if he thought it would have a tendency to disturb the Administration." When he sat down, I said to him, "Why, Brougham, it must have a tendency to disturb the Administration." "Well," said he, "I can't help it."

Ministers had a majority of only 55; 28 of our side voted with Government, so that, if we had gone the other way, the amendment would have been carried. The House was very thin for a first day, and the tone of Ministers very low. There were symptoms of a falling cause even amongst the placemen.

O'Connell made his maiden speech, which attempted no flights.

February 11.—It was remarked that O'Connell had spoken almost every night since taking his seat, and had spoken sensibly. O'Connell's Parliamentary value was, at that time, underrated. Solicitor-General Doherty, speaking to me of him, said, "Mark my words: he will turn out nothing; he will sink down gradually to his proper dimensions."

February 12.—Sir James Graham made the speech which was the foundation of his Parliamentary fame. He concluded with a motion for reducing salaries to the standard of 1797; but Dawson proposed resolutions similar in effect, and not clogged with the Currency question, so that there was no division, and Graham gave

way. Peel concluded the debate by stating that 1830.
Government would pursue its course fearlessly,
although fully aware of the opposition to be
encountered in Parliament; but, at the same
time, secure of the final support of the great
majority of the people out of doors.

February 14.—I dined with the Speaker, and
Daniel O'Connell sat opposite to Mr. Speaker.
Oh rare! thought I. Who would have thought
of this two years ago?

February 18.—There came on the debate on the
Marquis of Blandford's Reform Bill. As no
Ministerialist spoke, the debate would soon have
dropped if I had not unwisely got up and made
something of a flourish, which brought up Horace
Twiss, who roused Sir Francis Burdett.

Brougham proposed to substitute a general
resolution for Blandford's Bill, and our intention
was to vote for it; but, by some unaccountable
confusion, we voted for Blandford's Bill, and had
but a small minority—only 57.

FROM DIARY.

February 20.—The Byron copyrights, all but
"Don Juan," sold by auction yesterday for 3,700
guineas. There was no bidding for "Don Juan"
beyond 310 guineas. We might have got 4,000
guineas if the auctioneer had trusted Colburn,
who gave him *carte blanche* to exceed Murray
until he was stopped. However, we did pretty
well.

1830. FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

On the morning of February 22 I was at the House of Commons in Committee on my Select Vestries Bill. The next day Lord J. Russell made his proposal for giving members to Birmingham, Manchester, and Leeds. We divided 140 to 188. Huskisson and his friends, besides one or two Anticatholics, voted with us.

The *Morning Journal* of February 24th contained an article charging me with voting with Ministers against Lord John Russell's Reform proposal. This was too bad. I went to the office of the paper, and said I could not permit my votes to be falsified; the article was therefore contradicted.

FROM DIARY.

February 27.—At a party of thirty to-day at Windsor, the King holloed to the Duke of Devonshire that "he did not understand these reforms and retrenchments; he would give up the crown, and ask to be Prince of Wales again. But," added he, "they won't let me. No, nor will they have any more Dukes."

Now, I can't understand how my friend Burdett and others strive so to turn out an Administration which stands so ill at Court. As for myself, I will have no hand in such an exploit, difficult as it is sometimes to support the acts of Government, and compelled as I am to vote for all reforms and retrenchments.

February 28.—Lord Tweeddale, who had been 1830.
talking to Sir G. Murray and the Duke of Wellington on the state of the Administration, told me that both had said that the wishes of most individuals in either House were of the most liberal tendency, but they felt they had obstacles at Windsor and from their partisans. It appears that the dumb mouths on our Treasury Bench are to be opened and Peel to be supported.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

March 7.—We dined at Lord Holland's in Savile Row. Mr. Allen was in great force, and told me several stories which I had reason to believe were true. When the Whigs came into office in 1806, several American despatches were found in Lord Mulgrave's office unopened. I had heard a similar story of a closet full of American despatches in the Duke of Newcastle's time, and I recollected a remark made on that anecdote by ——. "Yes, that is very true, and those who succeeded Newcastle took to reading despatches; and what was the consequence? The American war."

Mr. Allen also mentioned that Mr. Windham, having taken great pains in writing a despatch to the officer commanding our troops in South America, being summoned down to the Norfolk election somewhat suddenly, put the despatch in his pocket, and found it there six weeks afterwards.

He also said that Wilmot Horton gave orders

1830. to the Commander of our naval forces on the African coast to make reprisals on one of the Barbary powers, as a punishment for some insult of which he found an account in a despatch at his office. A short time afterwards it was discovered that the said Secretary had not noticed the date of the said despatch, nor of the insult; and that the one was three years back, and that the other had been explained and forgiven.

March 12.—I called at Messrs. Ransom's bank, and there heard that my friend of many years, Douglas Kinnaird, had died that morning. He was resigned and composed, and discussed matters of business with his partner, Mr. Squire, with perfect self-possession. Even in those days I could not help thinking there was a fatality attending the friendships of my early days. Edward Vernon, Charles Matthews, Byron, Kinnaird, all gone.

In the evening I attended Parliament, and voted with Sir James Graham against the appointment of Treasurer of the Navy. Peel was excited more than usual, appealed to the public, and said that, if Ministers gained no credit by attempting to govern by opinion, they would govern by influence, as others had done. This was imprudent, and a tremendous cheer rose from our benches.

FROM DIARY.

March 19.—Attended the funeral of my poor

friend Douglas Kinnaird, and saw him laid in a new vault in St. Martin's Church. He was forty-two years old. 1830.

Some of the mourners seemed much affected, but a grey-headed servant of the bank, who was looking on at a distance, cried bitterly, an undeniable proof of my friend's kindness. It is a sad ceremony indeed, if it were nothing but a ceremony.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

This Session we had a debate of four days, on inquiry into the causes of national distress.

March 26.—We had a lively debate on Dundas and Bathurst's superannuation pensions. It appeared to me to be a rank job, and I made a speech to that effect. Our numbers were 139 to 121, and several members said to me, "We owe that to your speech."

On March 27, dining with my sister Mrs. Alexander, I sat next to a gaunt, coarse-looking, middle-aged man, who hardly spoke a word all dinner-time, although sitting next to Mrs. Lockhart, Sir Walter Scott's most pleasing daughter. I felt vexed when I heard I had been sitting next to Wilkie, the great artist, without having an opportunity of hearing a word from him.

Admiral Sir William Hotham was of the party. He told us some stories about the mutiny at the Nore and Spithead. He said the mutineers scrupulously preserved all the property of the

1830. officers, and replaced some crockeryware which was accidentally broken. He told us also that Admiral Duncan, when left to watch De Winter, had only three ships with him, but managed, by making signals, to make the Dutch believe that the whole fleet was at hand. When De Winter was afterwards told this, he would not believe it; but I did, for Admiral Hotham was a very truth-speaking man.

FROM DIARY.

March 30.—I went to Devonshire House with my wife. I hate this amusement, as it is called, worse than ever. I have no turn nor capacity. Miss Fanny Kemble was the lion of the evening. I never saw any celebrated woman so very plain.

March 31.—At Vestry Committee, where we considered our Report, and agreed to some resolutions which I had drawn up, recommending a legislative measure founded on an elective principle. Mr. Ross, seconded by Sir Thomas Fremantle, moved counter resolutions. After much battling we overpowered the M.P. for Oxford, eighteen to two, and agreed almost unanimously to my resolutions.

Thus closes the first part of my Vestry labours, prosperously as far as I have gone, but the Bill remains behind, and I can hardly promise myself success in both Houses of Parliament.

April 1.—I sat up till near three in the morning to hear Peel propose his amendment of

the forgery laws. There were not above eighteen members in the House, but Peel spoke as if there were five hundred. At last we dwindled to some four or five, and I was the only man who did not speak and compliment the Home Secretary. 1830

At half-past two I brought up the Report of the Vestry Committee, when there was only one other member in the House. The members are absolutely worn out with the unremitting long nights. The Speaker confessed to me that he was, and said that nothing but Easter would save him.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

Early in the month of April my friend Sinclair Cullen sent me some papers from the executors of Ugo Foscolo, in order that I might examine them, and see whether there were in them materials for a Memoir. I looked over them, but did not find much to add to the short notice contained in my work on Italy.

Foscolo was born in 1778, on January 26. His father was a doctor. In only one of the documents do I find him called Count. In general he is described as "Captain," but here, in England, his arms were surmounted by a coronet.

He came to England in 1816. It appeared by these papers that he had attained to considerable skill in writing English. I observed in these documents many evidences of the squabbles in

1830. which this most unhappy man was perpetually engaged. That he was a man of very great genius there can be no doubt, and that he was a most unhappy man cannot be denied.

April 5.—Robert Grant moved for leave to bring in a Bill to remove the disabilities affecting the Jews. Peel was absent on account of his father's illness. To our infinite surprise, we divided 115 to 97. I walked across the House, and said to Calcraft, then on the Treasury Bench, "By Jove! you will be turned out if you go on in this way." "Aye," replied he; "but you know you like a good weak Government." I might have said, "Yes, but not a bad weak Government." I was, however, too angry to play on words.

I passed the Easter holidays of this year with my brother Henry, at a pretty country residence hired by him near Guildford, called Send Grove.

The clergyman at Send was of a sort more frequently met with in those days than now. I heard the good man preach: he chose the story of Balaam for his sermon, and called the prophet "a singular character"; but surely the ass was a more singular character, but of him he said not one word. It was not a fit subject for a sermon, nor for a joke.

At this time, April and May, I had much of my time taken up by looking after Lord Byron's affairs, and taking advice as to the expediency of

giving some public refutation to a charge made, 1830.
as was stated, by Lady Byron, in regard to the separation between Byron and his wife. The attack on Lord Byron, on the authority of Lady Byron, was countenanced by Tom Campbell, who was a first-rate poet no doubt, but a very bad pleader, even in a good cause, and made therefore a most pitiable figure when he had no case at all. I consulted friends, and amongst them Lord Holland, who strongly recommended silence, and did not scruple to say that the lady would be more annoyed if she were left unnoticed than if, whether wrong or right, she had to figure in a controversy. I was far from wishing to annoy her at all; my sole wish was to do my duty by my friend; and I hope I have done that sufficiently by leaving behind me, to be used if necessary, a full and scrupulously accurate account of the transaction in question.¹ I shall content myself here with asserting that it was not fear, on the part of Lord Byron, that persuaded him to separate from his wife. On the contrary, he was quite ready to "go into court," as they call it.

FROM DIARY.

April 23.—Read a good deal of Bourienne's Memoirs. It seems to me the best and fairest book yet written about Napoleon.

April 26.—I returned to London. Nothing

¹ This account is published in the last chapter of Volume II.

1830. done in the House; the rumour strong that the King is dying. His illness, however, creates very little interest, considering what his death must produce. They say the Duke and Peel will remain in office, but that King William will make changes in some departments.

April 27.—At House of Commons. The Terceira¹ business was brought on by Charles Grant in a bitter and eloquent speech. Whilst I went away to dinner the House was near coming to a division, but Twiss was put up and made a speech, or rather read a speech from several folios of paper; so that some of the wags opposite drew lots who should call him to order, and John Russell won the lot. Accordingly Russell complained of Twiss reading his speech, and brought up Mr. Under-Secretary, who said he had not read, but only looked at *voluminous* notes!! Here's a fellow!

We had but a poor division, 78 only, though all the Huskissonians voted for us, but many Whigs kept away. They care little for Portugal and less for Huskisson's party.

May 3.—Found that R. Gordon had made a smart attack on the miscellaneous estimates in the House of Commons. I took the opportunity of speaking, and believe I got votes by what I

¹ In December 1828 Count Saldanha sailed from England for Terceira with a party of Portuguese refugees who were adherents of the Queen's cause. The ship was, however, stopped off Terceira by Captain Walpole, under the orders of the British Government. The Duke of Wellington defended this action as a maintenance of neutrality between the rival Portuguese parties.

said, which, as our good people think Parliament 1830.
is dying, is no great exploit.

May 4.—The Speaker said to me to-day at House of Commons, "I think, Mr. Hobhouse, you must be at the height of your glory now; if you admire a good weak Government, you had your heart's content last night."

Certainly never did an Administration cut a poorer figure. If not strong enough to carry their jobs, they should not attempt so to do. We shall have no more estimates till Peel comes back, and even his presence will not calm the death-bed terrors of some county members.

May 5.—Dined at Hudson Gurney's. Bart. Frere¹ and Terrick Hamilton, author of "*Antar*," there. The latter is a most disagreeable fellow indeed.

Mrs. Gurney was saying she should like to have a lock of Napoleon's hair. Terrick Hamilton said, "I would not care for a lock of his hair more than for that of a *nager*"; and then he fell to abusing him, and saying he never had any curiosity about seeing such a man, and that Buonaparte was too well treated at St. Helena. Suppose, said somebody, that one of the sovereigns at war with Buonaparte had been taken by the French and treated so, what would you have said? "Oh," said T. H., "that is another thing. Buonaparte was not born a King"!!! I

¹ Bartholomew Frere, brother of John Hookham Frere; Acting Minister in Spain 1809-10; served afterwards at Constantinople.

1830: could not help saying that I had heard a good many bold and strange things said in my lifetime, but nothing quite so extravagant as that. Yet T. Hamilton is reckoned a very clever fellow, and may be so for all I know.

Sir J. Sebright was of the party, and told us of his skill in instructing puppies. He can make them extract cube roots. He does it by the eye entirely. One of Sir John Sebright's daughters has invented an expeditious mode of extracting cubes, which he showed me. What between his dogs and his daughters, his family must be an ingenious circle!

Sebright told us some examples of Sir Astley Cooper's egregious vanity. Sir A. Cooper was, it seems, almost a Jacobin once, but is now a worshipper of King George IV. Not long ago he made a speech, and dwelt upon His Majesty's peculiar regard for truth!!

May 7.—King's birthday kept, and a favourable bulletin. It is said the King insisted it should be so on his birthday, but Paddy Holmes said to me, "Don't believe a word of what you hear; he is dying."

Looked at some letters of Byron's to Kinnaird, which young Lord Kinnaird has just given to me. Amongst them is the last he ever wrote, dated Missolonghi, April 10, 1824, the very day he was taken ill. He says in the end, "I have been very unwell, but am thought to be stronger."

May 14.—I hear that Sir Robert Peel has left

his younger sons nearly £200,000 apiece, and that 1830.
his eldest has about £40,000 a year.

Went to House of Commons, and voted with Sir J. Graham for a return of salaries of Privy Councillors. Goulburn offered a return of all salaries; but that was not invidious enough, and was rejected. Grosvenor (General) said that he was surprised at Graham's factiousness, as at the beginning of the Session he had declared that he differed with the minority only on the *trifling* question of the currency.

This was cheered very much; and certainly there seems some reason to suspect that Graham has more than a public motive for his present virulence against Government. He is always, besides, taunting the Opposition with their feeble hostility, and said that in the good old days the benches near him were not filled with *His Majesty's Opposition*. This saying of mine, and the other about the "good weak Government," are often in his mouth. I shall, one day or the other, take an opportunity of saying what I think of the *old Opposition*, about whom there never was a more complete delusion.

Graham speaks very well, and will be in high office some day or the other. He is, however, too personal in his invective. We had 147 to 232, a poor minority for such a question on the eve of dissolution.

May 16.—Saw Lord Lauderdale, and had much talk with that very clever old man. It seems

1830, that Brougham got defeated at the Anti-slavery meeting on Saturday. He does not bid high enough for the people now, and is most unjustly suspected of want of sincerity.

May 17.—The second reading of the Jews Relief Bill came on in the House of Commons, when Sir R. Peel made his first appearance since his father's death, and spoke against the Bill. Brougham's was the speech of the night. He was most successful, but was not well heard—too deep and too learned for the multitude. His reference to Gibbon and Bolingbroke as professed infidels, though admirably introduced, failed of effect.

May 20.—I read my Vestry Bill a second time, and committed it.

May 22.—Went to Holly Lodge and saw the many ways by which the good-natured hostess tries to make all the world forget that such a person as Miss Mellon ever lived. Very few of the great people who used to court Mrs. Coutts were, however, there. They do not choose to accept favours which they must return at the hazard of having precedence taken of them in London by the *ci-devant soubrette*. There was no very prominent absurdity in the spectacle, except that the Duchess¹ was drawn in a garden phaeton up and down a hill, preceded by a band

¹ The 9th Duke of St. Albans married, on June 16, 1827, the daughter of Matthew Mellon, who was widow of Thomas Coutts. She died in 1837.

of Prague minstrels and followed by her guests 1830
in procession. I have seen the sight once, and
shall never see it again.

May 25.—Went to the orchestra at Covent Garden, and saw Fanny Kemble, for the first time, in the character of Juliet. I was delighted, particularly with her tenderness. The tones of her voice are most impressive and agreeable, her manner soft and engaging, her action natural and easy. If she was unequal in any part of the play, it was in the horror expressed for fear she should awake in the vault. There, I think, she was too loud and passionate. On the whole I was much affected, and know not when the enchanting poetry of the play has so charmed me.

May 26.—Walking to-day I met Tom Campbell, the poet, and took a turn with him. He said very quietly to me that he thought the Christian religion was getting into general disrepute, much more so than the monarchy.

The man has a half-crazy look and air, and whilst we were talking of Kemble asked me if I could give him any anecdotes for the Life which he was writing of him. He soon recollected we were *not* speaking of Lawrence. He confessed that the biography of that great painter was a difficult task. There was nothing to tell.

May 28.—At House of Commons. O'Connell proposed Radical Reform, Universal Suffrage, Ballot, and Triennial Parliaments. Lord John

1830. Russell followed with his moderate Reform, which stood on the books for a separate motion. Three or four young members opposed all reform, in speeches which the House would not listen to.

Brougham turned round to me and said, "The election is coming on, Burdett is not here; by heavens you must speak, and if you do not I will say something to call you up."

I therefore rose at past 12, and made what was thought a very good speech, of which Brougham made honourable mention in his, saying it was one of the ablest he had ever heard in Parliament. I defended Universal Suffrage, Ballot, and Short Parliaments; but declared myself for any reform, preferring that which united the greatest number of partisans.

We divided 13 for Radical Reform. Afterwards we divided for Russell's Extended Basis of Representation, 117 to 213.

May 30.—I saw O'Connell to-day at Brooks's. He talked to me about the state of Ireland previously to passing the Relief Bill, and said that Tipperary alone would have turned out 150,000 fighting men. They had most of them pikes, and many firearms.

A friend of his, whilst shooting on the moors, was asked whether the Counsellor (meaning O'Connell) intended to *call them out that year*. He issued a sort of proclamation to keep them quiet; but a man high in office in Dublin told

him not to disarm the Catholics until six weeks after the meeting of Parliament. "This," said O'Connell, "was honest and open enough for a Government man, and will show you how the Relief Bill was passed." 1830.

O'Connell complained to me of the Duke's obstinacy in persisting in the taxing of Ireland at this moment. He said that the Duke of Wellington was not a great man; he was a great soldier, but every age produced great soldiers and great lawyers, which showed that great genius was not requisite for such productions. A great genius was more rare, and appeared but once in a century, if so often. There is something in the observation!

May 31.—Dined with the Belgraves. Young Stuart Wortley at dinner told me that he expected the Ministry would not last long. He confessed it was no very pleasant task acting under Peel. His manners were cold, and very little assistance was required by him from anybody.

June 4.—I dined at John Smith's, and met there Sam Rogers. He told me that he saw Lord Aberdeen on Monday last, and that he seemed much vexed at Prince Leopold's refusal of the crown of Greece. Rogers said he wondered any one who had bread to eat should wish to be in office. Lord Aberdeen said, "True, but I should not like to leave office either, although I should not be so sorry as my predecessor was."

1830. *June 5.*—I am deplorably idle, but help now and then others who are active. Ten days ago I joined a party at the Admiralty and founded a Geographical Society. This is the Society which, under the guidance chiefly of Sir Roderick Murchison, has grown to such formidable dimensions. If I were to give up the small shop business of politics, and confine myself to the consideration of important questions, perhaps I could do something, but I do not know this.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

I find recorded that on Sunday, June 6, I went to St. John's Church, and guessed, by the unusual muster of fashionable folk, that something good was expected. I was not wrong, for Sydney Smith preached a funeral sermon; and, to my mind, a very good sermon it was. His manner was rather energetic than impassioned or pleasing; his voice more loud than distinct. I was much gratified, and thought the sermon too short. It lasted only thirty-five minutes.

The text was the famous comparison of the seed that dies before it produces grain with the resurrection of man, for which Voltaire in a most unseemly manner insults the Apostle of the Gentiles. My friend's principal argument was that, as nothing seems to have been created in vain, so God would not have implanted the desire and expectation of futurity in man if he were never to attain to it. He said that the belief in a second life seemed

to have been implanted in every human heart, and might be called universal. I thought this had been denied, and that whole nations had been discovered without any such faith or hope. He also drew the desired conclusion from the progress and improvement of man alone of all created beings,—and here he was eloquent; and from the love of posthumous fame,—and here he was pathetic; and from the fear of death,—a topic which he also handled with great effect. It was a great relief, after being so long wearied with tiresome House of Commons talk, to listen to a good lecture on a subject interesting to all. 1830,

June 7.—I spoke and voted with Sir James Graham against some extravagant items in the charges for South American missions; and I paired in favour of Sir James Mackintosh's proposal to abolish the punishment of death in all cases of forgery, except the forgery of wills.

FROM DIARY.

June 10.—I went to a party at Lady Graham's given to celebrate the marriage of my young friend Lord Seymour with the remaining daughter of Tom Sheridan. Her face has been her fortune. Her sister, Mrs. Norton, sang and acted a song of her own.

June 14.—At a Committee on my Vestry Bill. A very ungracious task, and by no means a labour of love!

1830 *June 19.*—Talking with Attwood of Birmingham, who seemed to think that popular associations might procure Reform, if contending for moderate measures upon the “conservative principle.” He said he was convinced that the whole people of England were essentially aristocratic and imbued with respect for their superiors, and hatred of those neighbours raised by accident above themselves. I believe this is true.

FROM BOOK, “RECOLLECTIONS.”

June 15.—Mr. Samuel Whitbread called on me and told me he intended to retire from Middlesex at the next election, and asked me to write his retiring address to the electors for him.

I called on Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Place, and we agreed that the man most suitable for the electors and most fit for the situation was Mr. Hume. Accordingly I communicated with Mr. Hume, who naturally enough talked of the probable expense of a contest, adding he was sure of his seat for the Scottish borough which he then represented. At last, however, he consented to be put in nomination. Lord Althorp fell into our project at once, but said some of the Whigs might be hostile, and it would be advisable to consult at once with Lord Grey. This he did. At first his Lordship was restive, but ended by saying that, if Hume was taken up by the Reformers, it would be expedient for

the Whigs not to oppose; but, on the contrary, 1830.
co-operate and support Hume.

Lord John Russell said that the Duke of Bedford objected to Hume, but wished me to stand for Middlesex, in which case he, and the Duke of Devonshire and all the great proprietors of the party, would support me, and keep me in for life. I said it was impossible to think of such a thing. Hume was still very undecided, even after he had agreed to come forward, and on June 22 I told him he must positively give his final answer the next day.

I dined at Sir Francis Burdett's, and met Attwood of Birmingham, Lord John Russell, Mr. D. Davenport, and others, whose agreeable conversation contrasted pleasingly with the electioneering talk to which I had been lately accustomed.

The next evening, at the House of Commons, Mr. Warburton showed me a letter which he had drawn up for Hume to sign. It was a refusal to stand for Middlesex. A short time afterwards Warburton told me Hume had made up his mind to come forward for the county. I said it was too late now, and that, if I was to take an active part in the contest, my consent was indispensable. Warburton owned Hume had misconducted himself, but begged me to do nothing until the next day.

June 25.—Warburton showed me two letters signed, Joseph Hume; one of them declining to

1830. stand for Middlesex, the other consenting to be a candidate. I said it was very hard to throw the weight of abandoning the project upon me, which would inevitably be the case if I accepted the letter of resignation. It was agreed it would be difficult to find any other man besides Hume. Warburton then said that "he would be answerable for £2,500 of the expenses to support Hume."

I consented to take the letter of assent on condition that I might refer to Lord Althorp and Mr. Warburton in case of any future difficulty; and so, all of us confessing Joseph Hume to be a very shabby shuffling fellow, yet believing he might be a useful member for Middlesex, we came to the resolution of standing by him, heart and hand. I made this remark in my Diary: "If Hume should be returned for Middlesex, he of course will forget that he owes his seat to me twice over: once, when I commended the project to Burdett and Place; and again, when I accepted his affirmative instead of his negative answer."

I went to the Committee-room, and commenced operations immediately, writing circulars and private letters.

I apologise to those whom it may concern for this tiresome story, about a long-forgotten episode of our times and adventures.

FROM DIARY.

June 25.—There was no House of Commons

to-day: some said because the King was dying, 1830.
others because the Ministers were afraid; but
there was a serious conflict in the Lords, Lord
Grey taking a most hostile attitude on the
Galway Franchise Bill. Ministers had a majority
of only 15!

We dined at the Duke of Somerset's. Singularly
enough, I sat between my wife and Lady
Charlotte.

Lord Tavistock and I had a great deal of talk
on politics. We agreed as to the strange incon-
sistency and weakness of Lord Grey's general
conduct, sometimes coquetting with Ministers,
and then undoing all previous courtship by un-
reasonable hostility. Now, with the prospect of
a new reign, this change has much the air of
shabbiness. Yet he is not a shabby man; far
from it, only peevish and wayward.¹

Lord Dudley dined with us, and was in one of
his most absent moods.

June 26.—This morning, whilst I was reading
in bed Cunningham's *Life of Flaxman*, I heard
two reports of great guns. A little later I saw
a man in the street with newspapers in mourning,
and crying the sorrowful news, George IV. had
died at ten minutes past three this morning.

I went to the House of Commons a little after
twelve, and found many Members waiting to be

¹ I had many opportunities, after writing this, of seeing Lord Grey
when I was Secretary-at-War, and Secretary for Ireland, under him;
and I believe I did not make any mistake in taking this view of
him.—B.

1830. sworn in, but the Lord Steward had not arrived. The Lords had taken the oaths to King William IV. Coming through the Park, I saw the Duke of Wellington and Peel going to St. James's, where his new Majesty had arrived and gone through the usual ceremonies. I heard that the new King would not be proclaimed until Monday, at eleven o'clock.

Warburton and I walked to the House of Commons, and joined a crowd of Members in the long gallery. We were just in time to write down our names, and to hurry over the oaths with the rest—all of us squeezing and giggling, and running off to the House to be in time to take the oaths at the table of the House. The swearing was going on with much rapidity, but I was not soon enough to go through my part of the ceremony. It was four o'clock, and the Speaker adjourned the swearing to ten o'clock on the following Monday. The oath was printed, but, to save time, the name of George IV. was scratched out, and William filled up in writing.

After I went away Brougham made a vehement speech against the Marquis of Conyngham for keeping the House waiting, and contrasted his conduct with the considerate conduct of His Majesty William IV., who had sent for the Speaker to facilitate all the forms. "Conduct," said our orator, "that called forth his gratitude, and expressions which would find a responsive echo in the breast of every man who heard

him." Loud cheers, says the paper. Oh, to 1830.
be sure!

I saw nothing like grief or joy—only a bustle in the streets. Walking afterwards in the Green Park, I saw the Royal carriage with the Life Guards escorting William IV. up Constitution Hill, on his way back to Bushy Park. Now, though I cannot be supposed to have cause to care for George IV. or regret him in any way, yet I own there was something melancholy and disagreeable to me in the sight of his successor in the instant enjoyment of Majesty, whilst his brother's body was scarcely cold. What a change, too, for him—coming up in his travelling carriage and stepping from it to a throne. The common question is, how long will it be before he is crazy?

Burdett called, and said history would have but a sad tale to tell of George IV. The *Times* threatens a character "for the benefit of his successors."

C. Moore told me that King William IV. was seen on the road to London this morning, in his carriage, with a bit of crape on a white hat, grinning and nodding to everybody as he whirled along. This may not be true, but the rumour shows the character.

June 27.—

Vanessa, not of years a score,
Sighs for a gown of forty-four!!!

*June 28.—*I saw the ceremony of proclaiming

1830. King William IV. A pretty sight. The crowd was orderly, the acclamations confined to the heralds and officiating people.

I went to the House of Commons and took my oaths at the table. Sir G. Murray, Goulburn, Herries, and Peel were sworn at the same time. I thought they all looked a little mournful, but it was said they were very well received by the new King, who was very formal with Lord Grey.

June 29.—Peel brought down a message from the King announcing immediate dissolution of Parliament.

June 30.—Peel explained the intentions of the Government as to putting off all but very urgent business, and not settling either the Civil List or the Regency question. His tone was very humble. Lord Althorp proposed a delay of twenty-four hours to consider subjects of such vast importance as the Regency; and Brougham took the same line, and then left the House. We divided 139 to 185.

I heard that Althorp had communicated with Lord Grey, who moved in the Lords for a similar delay, and seemed in determined opposition to Ministers. Lord Ellenborough, nothing daunted, told him that an open enemy was better than an insidious friend. The Lords in opposition could muster only 51 against more than double their number.

After our division in the Commons, Lord Althorp moved an amendment to the Address,

1830.

recommending the settlement of the Regency before the dissolution of Parliament. Everything seemed going on quietly enough, and we had not made up our minds about dividing on Althorp's amendment, when Brougham came in, I supposed from dinner, and soon commenced a speech which grew more furious as he went on; and, after personally singling out Mr. Dundas and Lord Castlereagh for ironically cheering him, and exposing them to the ridicule of the House in every possible way, he, at last, insulted the whole bench of Ministers, by calling them "base, fawning parasites of the Duke of Wellington." On this Sir Robert Peel rose to order, and asked Brougham whether he included him in the charge. There was great cheering, and loud cries of "Chair." Brougham replied that he did not allude to Peel, and he tried to get out of the scrape as well as he could; on which Sir Robert, with infinite skill and coolness, said he had no doubt that Brougham did not allude to him, or to anybody personally, and that it would have been better, instead of making an unsatisfactory explanation, to have said at once that he had been betrayed to use the words by the heat of the debate; and that, as Brougham had not made that excuse, he would make it for him. On this there was a cheer from all sides of the House; and Brougham rose and accepted Peel's interpretation of his language. So ended this scene, to the honour and glory of the Ministers, and, as usual,

1830. to the confusion of my learned friend, who, as Lord Howick told me, lost us at least four votes by his intemperance. We had, however, a strong division, being 146 to 193.

July 2.—I received a copy of Resolutions, passed at a meeting of Westminster electors, inviting Burdett and myself to be put in nomination at the ensuing election. I gave a formal answer in the affirmative, without any expressions of gratitude, which I cannot say I feel.

July 4.—I went to a meeting at Lord Althorp's after church to-day. There were about sixty Members there: Brougham, Lord Morpeth, T. Cooke, Sir James Graham, and many others whom I had not seen before.

It seems they had been discussing about forming a systematic Opposition, and when I came in, Cooke and others were congratulating the company upon the good old times of Whiggism and party being likely to be restored under the auspices of Lord Althorp. Morpeth and Sir James Graham said that the reason they had not attended these meetings before, was that they did not think they were sufficiently hostile to Ministers.

We discussed what was to be done about R. Grant's motion on the Regency question; and in spite of this wonderful and sudden union, there seemed to be a variety of opinions. It was finally agreed we should go in force ready

to divide or not, as best advised at the time, and so we separated, having, as Maule said to me, just done nothing. 1830.

Joe Hume, who was there for the first time, said the only sensible thing I heard, namely that unless Lord Grey and Lord Holland and other party men would declare for cutting down places and for more decisive reform than they ever had yet done, the people would not sympathise with any Parliamentary efforts of theirs.

July 5.—I had a talk with Calcraft on the state of parties. He confessed to me that Government had never been sure of a majority since their acceptance of office, and could not go on as at present constituted. Shortly after I had a conversation with Mr. Arbuthnot, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, who held nearly the same language. He owned, however, there was only one man of their opponents of whom they had reason to complain—that was Sir James Graham; for with him they had negotiations at the beginning of the Session, and had therefore no right to expect the violent and systematic opposition which he had given to them.

July 6.—R. Grant brought on his motion as to the necessity of settling the Regency question. Brougham made a humorous but offensive speech, and in a very inartificial manner ended by an eulogy of the Duke of Wellington, which pleased no one. Tom Moore, however, told me he was lost in admiration at the speech. In spite of it

1830. we made a wretched figure, only 93 against 247. Never was there a more complete defeat in a less worthy cause.

July 8.—Dined at Burdett's. Rogers and Moore there. A complete school for scandal, chiefly of and concerning Horace Twiss's dinners to the Duke of Wellington.

Rogers told me that he had tried to bring the Duke of Wellington together with Lord Grey and Lord Holland at his house at dinner, but it would not do. Lord Holland told many diverting stories and did his best, but His Grace never relaxed a muscle. This was in last May: who knows but this failure has sharpened Lord Holland's wits against the Duke? Everybody now sees the folly of the Whigs.

July 9.—I spoke and voted against the recognisance clause in the Libel Law Amendment Bill. Banishment for libel abolished, after eleven years of existence in the Statute Book, during which time it has never once been acted upon.

We went to a party at Lord Grey's, and in came the Duke of Wellington, who was as gay and affable with mine host as if nothing had happened. This is the way to succeed in the world.

July 10.—I dined with Lady Cork, Dr. Johnson's dunce. She seemed physically to be rather breaking, but then she is eighty-six. Intellectually she is as young as ever. Her brother, Mr. Monckton, was at the table; he was eighty-

eight. Lord Robert Spencer was there also; he too was eighty-eight. A more pleasant evening I had not passed for a long time. 1830.

July 11.—News arrived that Algiers was taken on the 5th of this month.¹

July 15.—George IV. buried to-day. Lord Tweeddale, who was at the ceremony, told me that the account in the *Times* was every word true. It was a tiresome, ill-managed, tawdry pageant. Not a tear was shed, nor a sigh heard. Faces scarcely grave. William IV smiling and chatting.

I called this day on Lord Lauderdale, and heard that Lord Jersey was made Lord Chamberlain. The Duke of Wellington announced the appointment to him by letter. He was at Newmarket, and did not receive it. Lady Jersey wrote to the Duke, asking for tickets for the funeral. He said that he had no tickets, and she had better apply to the proper officer—namely, the Lord Chamberlain. When Lord Jersey returned home she showed him the Duke's note, and he could not understand it, as he had not yet opened the Duke's letter.

Lord Lauderdale did not approve the appointment of the Duke of Buckingham to be Lord Steward, and told me that his Grace did not know his own mind for a quarter of an hour

¹ In consequence of an insult offered to the French representative by the Dey of Algiers, an expedition was sent under General de Bourmont and Admiral Duperré. After two battles and a short siege, Algiers was surrendered on July 6, 1830.

1830. together. In 1827 he wrote to him (Lord Lauderdale), asking him to sign a declaration of uncompromising hostility to Mr. Canning. Shortly afterwards he applied to Mr. Canning for a place. Soon after that he opposed the Ministers.

July 19.—I went to a public meeting at Marylebone, called to take into consideration my Vestry Bill. We had a very good meeting, and the whole proceedings passed off in a very satisfactory manner to me. I put to rights the misconceptions relative to my Bill.

The King is very lively. To-day he reviewed the Guards in St. James's Park, and made the officers kiss hands on parade!!

July 21.—I went to the King's Levee. The number of people greater than I have ever seen. The squeezing, and crowd, and heat tremendous. My name was mentioned in form to His Majesty by Lord Glenlyon, when the King said, "How d'ye do?" and gave me his hand to kiss. This I did without saying "Very well, thank ye," and so passed on. The Duke of Sussex gave me a most cordial shake by the hand, and seemed most happy to show his new court honours. He is Ranger of Windsor Park.

July 22.—This day Lord Grey told me that Sir R. Wilson was restored to his rank, and restored in the most full and obliging manner, being raised to a Lieutenant-Generalship, from date of 1825. Lord Grey remarked to me that the King had

done nothing but kind things since his accession and spoke in a tone very different from his late attacks on Ministers. 1830.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

July 23.—I went early to the House of Commons, and saw King William come down in state to prorogue the Parliament—a very fine sight on a very fine day. I squeezed into the Lords with our Speaker, and heard him deliver his speech to the King, in which he boasted of the great things done by the present Parliament. Not three weeks before, he had said to me, he did not know what the House had done by all its late sittings. These harangues, however, are so much a matter of course that they admit of a little exaggeration; and Sutton said what he had to say well, and in a full round voice. King William also performed his part well. He spoke with a clear sharp-toned voice, and what he said was good and agreeable to hear. He called us a free and a loyal people. He said the Catholic Emancipation Law was irrevocable. The Duke of Norfolk officiated as Earl Marshal on one hand of him, and the Duke of Wellington bore the sword of state on the other side. The King of Wurtemberg was present, but lost amongst our great folks. About 300 ladies were in the House. I saw His Majesty return to the palace. There was not much cheering; but, when the Duke of Wellington passed, the applause was very great.

1830. The dissolution of Parliament appeared in the *Gazette* of July 24, and perhaps my public life is at an end.

July 26.—I saw King William review between five and six thousand troops in Hyde Park. I was on the balcony of Lord Dudley's house in Park Lane. The arrangements were excellent, and, when the review was over and the crowd began to mix with the soldiers, the multitude appeared innumerable. They were in very good humour, and cheered the King, the Queen, the King of Wurtemberg, the Duke of Sussex, and all the Royal suite, particularly the Maids of Honour. The party at Lord Dudley's added a good deal to the gaiety of the scene; many of the most beautiful women in London were amongst them. In the balcony was Sir Sidney Smith, whom I had not seen for many years. He appeared to wear well, but looked rather like an old beau. He had just been made a General of Marines—another act of Royal kindness.

July 28.—The newspapers of this morning contained a report of the Polignac Ministers to Charles X., and two ordinances founded thereon—one of which abolished altogether the Liberty of the Press, and the other dissolved the Chamber of Deputies, and remodelled, or rather destroyed, the representative system in France. Our English press, of all shades in politics, held the same language, and said, "If the French bear this, they deserve to be slaves." The few people I saw on

this day held the same language; but I thought the general feeling was that they would bear it. They did not bear it; for on Friday, July 30, Rothschild received a despatch from Paris, saying that the people in Paris had taken up arms and were fighting with the King's troops when the messenger came away. This news drove the thoughts of the Westminster election, which was to take place the next day, out of my head; but I was obliged to attend to my own concerns when the time came. 1830.

July 31.—The crowd at Covent Garden was not great, but the attendance of our friends was very flattering. I hardly missed a man either of the old or young Westminster Reformers. When Burdett and I had done speaking, the High Bailiff read our names to the people, and, as no one else was proposed, declared us duly elected. Then came the glorious news from France. The King had fled—the people were everywhere triumphant—and the tricoloured flag was flying on the Tuileries and the Column of the Place Vendôme.

I was, perhaps more than was wise, transported with the Revolution of July, and wrote to Lafayette sending him £100 for the subscription opened for the families of those who fell during the short but decisive conflict.

August 5.—I went to Brentford, and met Mr. Hume and his procession of seventy-three carriages and two steamboats. Mr. Byng did not come until near two o'clock. They were both elected

1830. without opposition, and thanked the freeholders in speeches which were received as might be expected. Hume's address related chiefly to France.

Burdett, in his address to the Westminster electors, expatiated on French politics at length. This frightened some City friends, and kept the funds down. The cry amongst these timid people was, "Here is the revolutionary spirit in England, and we shall have another long war." The sagacious soldier at the head of the Government used language very different. He was angry, not with the French movement, but with those who had caused it. Calling at Messrs. Ransom's bank, Mr. Williams, the principal partner, told me that the Duke of Wellington had just been there, on business of his own, and asked "What French news there was in the City?" and, hearing what had been done by Charles X. and his Ministers, exclaimed, "Oh, oh! ay, damn'd fools! all soon over—all soon over—first resigned, then repented, then resigned again."

FROM DIARY.

August 10.—See by the *Courier* that the French Crown was decreed to be offered to the Duke of Orleans by the Chamber of Deputies on Saturday last, on condition of his swearing to the new Charter; and at 5 o'clock p.m. of that day a deputation from the Chamber walked from their place of assembly to the Palais Royal, and did in

the name of the French people offer the Duke the crown. Laffitte, the banker, read the new Charter and announced the decision of the Chamber as to His Royal Highness. The Duke answered shortly, accepted the crown and the conditions, and then threw himself weeping into the arms of Laffitte and Lafayette, so says the account in the French papers. All history does not record such a scene. I would have given half of my useless life to have witnessed it. 1830.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

August 9.—The Duke of Orleans proceeded in state to the Chamber of Deputies, signed the Declaration of the Representative body and the adherence of the Peers ; then swore to the observance of the new Charter ; and, being saluted Philip the First, King of the French, took his seat upon the Throne, and delivered a speech to the two Chambers.

A great dinner was given by His Majesty to a mixed party, Ministers, Peers, Deputies; and others, at which none of the old royal ceremonials were observed. This pleased the Parisians, who showed their attachment to equality, even whilst behaving with wonderful moderation. A crowd assembled whilst the Chamber was discussing the question of an hereditary peerage, and shouted "No Hereditary Peerage" so long and so loudly that Constant and Lafayette were obliged to address them before they would separate, with the under-

1830. standing that the subject would be considered hereafter.

FROM DIARY.

August 13.—Burdett has allowed the notorious Mr. Buckingham¹ to get up a dinner to commemorate the recent Revolution in France, without a word to our Westminster friends, who are in great perplexity. 'Tis a difficult thing to act with Burdett now; he is certainly losing his head, at least his memory.

August 18.—The dinner was well attended and went off very well. Sir Francis gave the health of King Louis Philippe and the French Nation. I gave the health of Lafayette and the National Guards of France. One newspaper reported that inflammatory placards were dispersed about. It was not true.

August 19.—The *Times* and *Herald* give a most wretched account of our dinner, and particularly so far as regards myself. However, this always has been my fate. If I have any fame it will not be newspaper fame. I do not think I ever spoke better in my life than at this dinner, nor was ever more applauded, but the report in these papers scarcely notices what I said. The *Chronicle* is more fair.

August 20.—I sent Warburton £50, my subscription to Joseph Hume's election, which, in

¹ James Silk Buckingham, who was expelled from India in 1823 for journalistic attacks on the Government.

1830.

consequence of my propositions to Warburton, will not cost Joseph Hume one farthing. Yet this worthy man on the day of his election said to our Westminster Chairman: "*I hope after this your Westminster Members will behave a little better.*" These Westminster Members made him M.P. for Middlesex.

I see that some of the Royal Family of France have landed in the Isle of France. Everything goes on prosperously at Paris. Philippe has named his Ministers. Benjamin Constant is Counsellor of State with a presidency; Lafayette, permanent Commander of the National Guards. The republican party complain that the "*doctrinaires*" are put at the head of affairs, and that the Faubourg St. Germain is succeeded by the Chausseé d'Antin. They are trying to adapt their reformed plans to the Chamber of Deputies, but find some embarrassment now that the initiative is not confined to the Ministers. They would do well to copy our formalities, which I think are sensible and the fruit of experience.

August 28.—News from France good. Polignac taken. He was disguised as servant to M^e de Fargeau and on the point of embarking at Granville. His rings and watch-chain, and his embarrassed manner it is said, betrayed him. His conduct since his apprehension has been that of an extremely weak man.

August 30.—This day Galt's Life of Lord Byron came down. I find he says that the "good critic

1830. who condemned 'Childe Harold' was probably Mr. Hobhouse."

I wrote John Galt a remonstrance for his gratuitous falsehood about me; hinting also that the idle stories in which he makes me figure with Byron were not very agreeable, although I was willing to overlook them; but I must have the "Childe Harold" conjecture cancelled.

On September 5 I received a letter from Galt promising to correct the error in the *Monthly Magazine*, and wished all he said of Byron or me to be "kindly considered." I do not quite know what line to take with him; *he has not got the sense or feeling which makes correction effectual.*

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

On August 31st came the news of a revolution in Brussels. In France also an outcry had been raised against what was called the new aristocracy, that is, *those who had got a little more money than their neighbours.* We were, however, happy to see that Lord Stewart, our Ambassador at Paris, had delivered his credentials in form to Louis Philippe.

FROM DIARY.

September 13.—Moved to Brighton, where my father and family were passing the autumn. Very much struck with the gaiety and number of the population, and the great addition to the

buildings since I was last there. The chain pier 1830.
admirable "pour sa noble inutilité," as Mme. de Staël says of music.

The first person I met on the road was the King, in a plain equipage. He drives about like any other private gentleman. The Queen rides about on horseback and bathes in the Royal Bath near the Steyne. In short, the worthy couple are like wealthy bourgeois.

Whilst my father's carriage was at our door, 10, Montpellier Road, the King came past and Colonel George Fitzclarence riding behind. Great greetings between his Majesty, the Colonel, and my father. All this is worth recording only in contrast with our late Asiatic monarch.

September 17.—The Liverpool and Manchester Railway was opened on Wednesday last. It is said there were half a million of people to witness the ceremony. The Duke of Wellington and Peel were present. Mr. Huskisson was getting down from his own car to shake hands with the Duke of Wellington, when he was stopped by some gentleman, who spoke to him and detained him on the railroad until the Rocket moved rapidly upon them, and in the hurry to get into the Duke's car, Huskisson was knocked or fell down, and the wheels of the Rocket went over one of his legs across the calf and thigh, and double-fractured both. He was conveyed to Eccles to the house of Mr. Blackburn, and died at nine o'clock at night. This fatal accident

1830. damped one of the most surprising sights that the world has ever witnessed. The carriage that carried Lord Wilton when he went for a surgeon travelled at the rate of thirty-three miles an hour.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

September 17.—Huskisson seemed to have been sincerely regretted at Liverpool, and he was in the enjoyment of a great reputation. Alexander Baring wrote to me saying that, the great Parliamentary light being extinguished, we must be content now with farthing candles.

An article in the *Times* said that his loss was irreparable. On reading this I made a remark, thus recorded: "I am not an unprejudiced nor a competent judge, but if this is true, England is in a very lamentable condition." My own opinion was that Huskisson, as a politician, might be missed, but would not be mourned. As a private man he was said to be very amiable.

•

CHAPTER X

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

September 25.—Lord Nugent has seen Charles X. 1830.
at Lulworth,¹ and heard His Majesty talk very
openly on French affairs. He said the Revolution
would soon pass away, and he be back again
in Paris.

The Duke of Norfolk also had a conversation
with Charles X. at Lulworth, and he told my
brother Henry that Charles drew a distinction
between the Duke of Wellington's policy in
granting Catholic Emancipation and his own
in opposing all liberal measures. He remarked
that the Relief Bill was the completion of
many concessions previously made to the Roman
Catholics, and he should, himself, have voted
for it; but that he and his family had never
willingly made any concessions to the French
Liberals, and that he had a right to recover
the privileges belonging to the Crown. He said
that he would take the same steps again if
he had the same assurances of success. He

¹ In August 1830 Charles X. fled to England and for some time
resided at Lulworth, near Swanage, the seat of the Weld family,
whence he proceeded to Holyrood.

1830. confessed, however, that his Ministers were to blame for not knowing the feelings of the French people. They had assured him that the Ordinances would be acceded to with little or no resistance. He concluded thus: "Pour moi et pour mon fils tout est fini; mais pour cet enfant [the Duke of Bordeaux], il sera le salut de la France."

FROM DIARY.

September 26.—My brother Henry tells me that the moneyed men entertain the greatest apprehensions of some catastrophe even in England, and that the great fall in the funds the other day was occasioned by Rothschild, and Jones, Loyd & Co., and Smith, etc., giving notice to those to whom they had lent money that they should want it soon. The borrowers made heavy sales accordingly.

September 28.—Lord and Lady James Hay dined with us. They have just arrived from France, and were in Paris during the great week. They gave us some particulars of recent events which we could not have had from any other quarter.

The Swiss and French Guard behaved well. Whenever a soldier fell he was either carried off in a hackney coach or dragged into some shop, where his mustachios was cut off and he was put to bed by the humane Parisian; but the Revolutionists were left in heaps where they fell.

All that the Hays mentioned confirms the general notion of the amiable character of Louis Philippe. They add that he is reckoned a man of great talent, and he is thought by the Parisians to write his Ministers' reports, etc. I hope not. They consider his Government the most stable in Europe, next to that of England. 1830.

September 30.—News confirmed of the insurrection at Brussels. I am not without apprehensions for the consequences—perhaps a Continental war, and then England forced into the struggle, which I contend she cannot support and pay the interest of her debt.

October 2.—Lady James Hay tells me that a Countess Montalembert (a Miss Forbes) is giving out here that Louis Philippe keeps a democratic court and desires folks to come in boots. This is false; but if it were so, have not the French gained more than such obliquities can compensate? “Point de boucles à ses souliers, alors tout est perdu.”

October 6.—John Galt has published in the new *Monthly Magazine* a letter which, so far from correcting his error, aggravates his offence. This fellow annoys me as much as if he was the first of biographers. Yet I knew him when Byron and I used to laugh at him as the most absurd of coxcombs, scarcely responsible for his conduct, for he had a touch of crazy folly about him.

October 19.—Lord and Lady Tweeddale with us, just come from Geneva by Paris. They

1830. say that they observed nothing particular in France, except that there were no carriages or fine-dressed women in Paris. Great apprehensions entertained for Ternaux's house, and even rumours about Laffitte. Rothschild has been transmitting gold in vast quantities to Paris, and eleven of Meurice's carriages are employed between Calais and the capital for that purpose.

Tweeddale says that all the people with whom he spoke were for saving the Ministers, but there was a cry against them. He hopes much from the National Guard; nevertheless many think that a crisis is at hand, and some anticipate a Jacobin insurrection. Amidst these wonders turns up another miracle: the Prince of Orange has declared the Independence of Belgium at Antwerp and half shaken off the Government of his father; no one knows how to account for his conduct.

October 22.—It seems that the rioters in Paris have received a check; politics seem to have taken a liberal complexion everywhere.

October 23.—The *Courier* of last night contains the good news that the King and Lafayette, supported by the National Guard and troops of the line, have, by their decided conduct, put down the Paris populace.

October 26.—Parliament met this day.

October 28.—Went down to the House of Commons. Took the oath and my seat. H. Brougham

and I held the swearing board together, and he 1830.
parodied the oath as we went on.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

October 29.—It was natural that the Revolution of July in France should cause much commotion and alarm in Europe, and more particularly in the neighbouring states. It could hardly be expected that the new kingdom of the Netherlands should escape the infection. But the struggle in Belgium lasted longer, and was more sanguinary, than it had been in France. A young English officer of the 43rd Regiment, of the name of Byrne, was present and saw the fighting.

He told me that the conduct of the Dutch troops was cruel in the extreme. He saw a poor old notary killed by a soldier, who knocked at his door, and, when he opened it, shot him dead. He also saw a citizen, who flung down his musket and called for quarter, deliberately shot; but he had the satisfaction of seeing the ruffian knocked over immediately afterwards. Two drummer-boys of thirteen and fourteen years of age were shot in cold blood. This gentleman assured me that the newspaper accounts of the atrocities committed by the Dutch soldiers had not been at all exaggerated.

November 2.—I went to the House of Commons, and found our folk full of fury and indignation at the King's Speech. It called the people at Brussels revolvers, and praised the administration

1830. of their Dutch King as being prudent and enlightened, and stated that England, in concert with her allies, was trying to restore good government, and what not; in short, a Holy Alliance speech. As to domestic matters: alarm, disaffection, and so forth. Doubtless the whole intended to recall the ultra-Tories to their old fears. We shall see.

Althorp declared against the foreign policy of the speech, and said that he should support Government when right and oppose them when wrong; and that he should not be deterred as he had been, by any fear of turning them out. I ought to have risen then, being resolved to oppose the Government *now*; as they have taken their line I have nothing left for it; but Lord Blandford got up and made a foolish speech, concluding with an amendment of a mile long against the late House of Commons, so I lost my turn and sat restless the whole evening, feeling I did not do as I wished nor as I ought.

Brougham made an admirable speech, pulling the King's Speech, especially the Belgic moderation, to pieces, but ended with a foolish flourish about "perishing with the aristocracy." He gave notice of bringing on his Parliamentary Reform motion on Tuesday, the 16th.

The Duke of Wellington made a speech in the Lords, and declared against Reform. I hear he was hissed, and hurt by a stone. The King was applauded.

1830.

November 3.—At the House of Commons I gave notice of addressing the Crown on non-interference with Belgic affairs. I was much cheered, and all told me I had done right. That remains to be proved, but I know I intend to do right. Lord Morpeth told the House that I had anticipated him only by a few minutes.

November 4.—Mr. Vanderweyer, one of the Belgian Provisional Government, came to me. He told me that he did not like to address himself to any member of the Government, until he was sure of a friendly reception. Accordingly I spoke to Sir George Murray, who assured me the Government felt no ill-will to the Belgians, and that the King's Speech did not mean any ill-will to them.

I heard this evening that a very unpleasant feeling was rising amongst the working-classes, and that the shopkeepers in the Metropolis were so much alarmed that they talked of arming themselves. The Duke of Wellington was not one of the alarmists; on the contrary, he told Lord Tweeddale that everything would end peaceably, and he might go to Scotland if he chose. Lord Tweeddale told this to me; but said, "Notwithstanding the Duke's opinion, I shall stay here. I am afraid of some catastrophe."

I heard everywhere that a great change had taken place in public opinion since the meeting of Parliament. The Duke was scarcely safe in

1830. the streets, and the King's popularity was evidently on the wane.

FROM DIARY.

November 5.—I went to the House of Commons, and on Croker taunting O'Connell for not having attacked Ministers on the address, I got up and told my mind very freely of the unfortunate conduct of the Government, and of my resolution now to oppose them systematically. Peel nodded his head and cheered me when I said I was no party politician.

November 6.—I walked about with Cornwall, son of the Bishop of Hereford, a Ministerial M.P. He told me that the Government were taking extraordinary measures to provide against the threatened commotions of the next week. Some of the treasure had been removed from the Bank, and several regiments ordered up to London. Many special constables had also been sworn in.

Mr. Cornwall owned to me that his friends had been very indiscreet in denouncing the Belgian revolt in the King's Speech, and he disapproved of the Duke's declaration against all Reform. Lord Dudley joined us, and we soon frightened him so much that he declared the Government had lost their senses; and that the Duke of Wellington, by refusing the franchise to Birmingham, had done more to promote the cause of Reform than all of us Reformers put

together. Saying this, "he went away sorrowing, for he had great possessions." 1830.

I went to Brooks's and heard rumours of the Ministry going out. Lord Durham spoke to me as if it was inevitable, and asked me whether I would take office under Lord Grey. I said that a Reforming Ministry might be joined by any Reformer. He said that the great difficulty would be to give great places to all, and that the members for great towns would expect them. I knew what he meant, but said nothing.

I dined with my friend David Baillie and a large mixed party: Lord Lansdowne, the Knight of Kerry, Spring Rice, and Pusey, M.P.

I sat next to Sir James Graham and had much talk with him. He is dreadfully alarmed, and thinks a revolution almost inevitable. He asked me whether I thought Joe Hume meant mischief. I said, "No." "What then did he mean by advising the people not to use premature force?" said Graham. "He meant nothing," said I; "he did not know the *meaning* of the word."¹

People seem to think that Ministers will be turned out on the Reform question. Lord Stafford and Lord Talbot have declared for Reform. The potentates begin to tremble for their acres.

Lord Lansdowne told me that the Duchesse de

¹ Joseph Hume, when speaking in the House of Commons, often employed wrong phrases, such as "It is not to be surprised at" meaning "It is not to be wondered at"; also "He is liable" instead of "He lied."

1830. Berri went to see our King open the Parliament, and, when she saw Prince Talleyrand's carriage in the procession, exclaimed, "Ah! voilà le tricolor," like a lively schoolgirl.

November 7.—I dined at Henry Brougham's, and I met there Lord Morpeth, Sir James Graham, Mr. Stanley (Lord Derby), Mr. Denman, James Brougham, Sir James Macdonald, and Lord Howick. After dinner we discussed our proceedings on Brougham's Reform motion, fixed for the 16th of November.

We agreed that Mr. Littleton of Staffordshire should be requested to second it. Sir James Graham told us that he had spoken to Lord Palmerston as to the line that he and his friends would take on the question. Eleven of that party met at Lord Palmerston's house, and Graham was informed that they were prepared to go all lengths, so far as respected turning out the Government; also that they would vote for enfranchising the great towns, and would vote for Brougham's motion, if vaguely worded. As to my motion on Belgium they could give no positive answer.

Just before going away I ventured to expostulate with Brougham on his eulogy of the aristocracy, and his resolution of perishing with it. I begged him to have recourse to no such topic in his Reform speech, not because the sentiment was incorrect, but because the people did not like to hear one of their principal champions re-echo the language of the corruptionists. Brougham

said he was sincere in the opinion. I replied that had nothing to do with the matter, the question was as to public feeling. Althorp doubted whether I was right, I insisted as to the fact. Graham said, if so, all their debates were futile, for if the public hated the aristocracy so much as I believed, then no Parliamentary reform would be satisfactory, and their labours were lost. I replied that the fact might be as he stated, but still we were to do what was right, and not to risk our influence by untimely expressions such as I objected to. By degrees, I think what I said had some effect, for Brougham promised to be very careful about such phrases for the future. 1830.

I left Brougham flattering Stanley by a remonstrance against his silence in Parliament.

N.B.—I took care to declare more than once that I was no Whig.

My impression was that these men are utterly ignorant of the state of the country, and will persevere deliberating on the miseries of petty political factions till the storm bursts over them, and all is over with them and the country.

November 8.—The King does not dine at the Guildhall to-morrow. Oh rare! Sir Robert Peel wrote to the Lord Mayor yesterday, saying:

“From information which has been recently received, there is reason to apprehend that, notwithstanding the devoted loyalty and affection borne to His Majesty by the citizens of London,

1830. advantage would be taken of an occasion, which must naturally assemble a vast number of persons by night, to create tumult, and cause confusion, and thereby endanger the lives and properties of His Majesty's subjects."

See to what a pass a few foolish words have brought the Government of the country!

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

I went to Brooks's, and found the greatest consternation prevailing there. No one knew what to think of this proceeding, nor could guess the cause of it. I heard that the City was in an uproar, and that the funds had fallen to 77 and a half. I went to the House of Commons. It was quite full of members and strangers; but the Treasury bench was empty, and Brougham began by complaining of the absence of Ministers, and the extraordinary conduct of the Government. Whilst he was speaking Peel came in, looking very pale. Then Lord Althorp rose, and asked him for an explanation of his letter to the Lord Mayor. Peel answered, and read a letter from the Lord Mayor elect, Alderman Key, informing the Duke of Wellington that an attack would be made on him on his approaching Guildhall. Here Colonel Davies and Mr. Tennyson broke into a horse laugh, on which Peel stopped, and then exclaimed, "Good God! is it come to this?" and he then went on to state that Ministers had received information which induced them to

advise His Majesty to postpone his visit to the City. The excuse was very ill received; and Brougham, in a speech more moderate than usual, pointed out the absurdity of taking so serious a step upon such authority, and also upon the unfairness of making the King suffer from the unpopularity of his Ministers. 1830.

Alderman Waithman then rose, and, for the first time, was well listened to. He complained of the conduct of Ministers, and, to the surprise of all, told the House that the communication of Alderman Key was not authorised by the Court of Aldermen, who had that day investigated the probabilities of disturbance, and had come to a unanimous resolution that there was not the slightest cause for alarm, or the least chance of mischief. He protested that the King was most popular, although the Ministers were unpopular. Alderman Thompson confirmed Waithman's statement, and read a resolution which the Court of Aldermen had passed that afternoon to the same effect.

This angered Peel, who said Ministers had no reason to doubt that Aldermen Key and Hunter, who came to them, were authorised to say what they did. Goulburn spoke very ill indeed, and talked of Ministers resigning, with satisfaction, if the House did not support them. We laughed, and Sir James Graham told Goulburn we should choose our own time for trying our strength with the Government. He concluded a good speech

1830. by exhorting the Duke of Wellington to resign at once. This concluded the debate, Ministers being completely discomfited, and looking as if on the verge of a precipice.

Then, as previously agreed upon, Lord Althorp rose and asked me to defer my Belgian motion. I consented; but took occasion to say that the Belgians would not submit to any dictation as to the form of Government they might choose. Peel answered me pettishly, and denied the intention of the Cabinet to dictate to Belgium.

Went to the first meeting of the Geographical Society. Lord Goderich, our President, made the inaugural speech.

November 9 was fixed for the expected insurrection, which some thought not a bad substitute for the Lord Mayor's show. Rumours of the resignation of Ministers were also very rife. But there happened neither insurrection nor resignation on that day, although there were great crowds in the streets, and the people seemed resolved upon having a holiday.

I walked about some time with Lord Althorp, an excellent person, too good for a party man. He told me that he should retire from public life the moment he got into the "Hospital for Incurables." Lady Spencer, his mother, when some one told her that "the poor were rising against the rich," "On the contrary," replied she, "it is the rich that are rising against the poor." Whatever may have been the causes of

the alarm, there can be no doubt but that it was very general. Lady Shrewsbury told my wife that the Duchesse de Berri said to her, a day or two ago, that the people of England were mad; and that, if our Ministers did not resist all Reform, England would soon fall into the same wretched condition as France!

The night of November 9 passed off quietly. The new police acted with equal vigour and prudence.

November 11.—I saw Mr. Vanderweyer, who told me the Duke of Wellington had written to him a very polite note asking to see him. He went, and was much surprised, so he told me, to see an infirm old man in an armchair, from which he raised himself with difficulty to receive him. He gave me an account of what passed between them. "Although," said he, "I am no diplomatist, I knew there was an advantage in not speaking first; and, as the Duke had invited me, and I had not invited myself, I remained silent. So did the Duke for a short time, and then began to talk.

"He was extremely civil, and said, 'Je vous donne ma parole d'honneur qu'il n'y a pas la moindre intention de notre part de nous mêler dans vos affaires.' He also said that he 'hoped the Belgians, in choosing a form of Government, would take care not to give cause for disquiet to neighbouring nations.' I answered that we should take care of that, provided there was no intervention."

1830. Mr. Vanderweyer appeared to me to be a most amiable, most honourable, and most intelligent man; and five-and-thirty years of intercourse with him have not altered the opinion that I then formed of him.

November 14.—I met Admiral Sir Edward Codrington, and he gave me an account of his recent interview with the Emperor Nicholas. I confess I was a little startled at his report of a conversation with His Majesty, relative to the recent revolution in France. The Emperor asked him what he thought of the conduct of the Duke of Orleans. Codrington said it had saved France from anarchy. The Emperor replied that the Duke of Orleans had only one line of conduct to adopt—namely, to follow the fortunes of the King. “Had he done so,” said the Admiral, “there would have been another Revolution of 1793.” The Emperor Nicholas rejoined, “Well! perhaps it would have been better if there had been.” Codrington on this remarked “that there might be two opinions on that matter”; and so the conversation ended. On a little reflection I was not much surprised that an Emperor of Russia should prefer any revolution to a family revolution.

November 15.—Belgium and Reform were put out of our heads by the events of this day, when Sir Henry Parnell moved to refer the Civil List to a Committee. We divided. Whilst in the lobby Brougham addressed us, and begged us,

in case we were beaten, to stay and try another question. Whigs, Radicals, Huskisson's friends, and ultra-Tories combined and numbered 233 to 204. When these numbers were announced there was some cheering, not much. I rose, and unwisely asked Ministers "whether they intended to resign"; but Brougham, in a friendly way, interfering, said a few words, and Parnell named his Committee. 1830.

FROM DIARY.

November 16.—The gossip at Brooks's is that the Duke of Wellington told Holmes last night that "the game was up." A very rainy day. As Lord North said, "Not a day to turn a dog out."

I went down to the House of Commons a little before 3—found it very full, and the gallery overflowing—various rumours. Althorp told me that some one in the Court of Chancery this morning had heard the Chancellor say, "We are out." Some of the official people, not Cabinet Ministers, came in, looking as if on the verge of dismissal. Sheriffs of London and Middlesex came to the Bar with a Petition about London Bridge and Reform of Parliament. Peel entered, looking very pale indeed, and talked with the Speaker. Alderman Wood made a tiresome speech about the City Feast and Reform of Parliament; when Peel rose, and said that his great respect for the House

1830. induced him to take the earliest opportunity of announcing that, in consequence of the occurrence of last night, he had waited on the King and tendered his resignation, which His Majesty had been graciously pleased to accept. He added that all his colleagues had pursued the same course. He then sat down: not a word was said; no cheers, nor signs either of joy or sorrow. Lord Althorp then rose, and, in a few solemn phrases, asked Brougham to put off his motion on Parliamentary Reform. Brougham rose, and with equal gravity protested that it was quite against his private wishes and opinions to defer his motion; and he added these words, which he, or some friend, has taken care to send to the *Times*: "As no change that may take place in the Administration can by any possibility affect me, I beg it to be understood that, in putting off the motion, I will put it off until the 25th of the month, and no longer. I will then, and at no more distant period, bring forward the question of Parliamentary Reform, whatever may be the condition of circumstances, and whoever may be His Majesty's Ministers." On hearing this, I said to Denman, "What the deuce does the man mean? You know as well as I do that he was for putting off the motion last night." Denman replied: "I confess I can't understand this sort of thing. He told me this morning there could be no doubt about the matter." I asked Brougham himself how he could have any doubts as to the

necessity of delay. He only laughed, and said something evasive. 1830.

Lord Blandford and I were talking together, just as Brougham crossed us, of the propriety of deferring the motion, and Blandford heard Brougham say, "I will not let my motion be made the stepping-stone of a party."

Now I am confident that Brougham and Althorp had settled the whole arrangement beforehand. As to B.'s not being affected by the change of Administration, I presume he means that his motion will not be affected, yet the words do not convey that precise meaning. He is a strange creature, and has done more to turn out the Ministry than any ten men besides.

Peel very unnecessarily corrected Althorp's expression of there being no Administration in the country, and said he should do his duty until his successor was appointed. We gave a cheer just out of candour, and then began to break up, leaving Waithman talking about Reform.

The Duke of Wellington made a similar announcement in the Lords, being scarcely audible, and retired immediately afterwards.

SO ENDS THE WELLINGTON ADMINISTRATION.

Their partisans say they will soon return to office; I think not. To me this appears "*le commencement de la fin*," as Talleyrand said of Buonaparte's defeat in Russia.

1830. That Peel may come in again is very likely indeed, but the Duke's age and his unpopularity will render it very inadvisable to place him again at the head of any Administration, except it shall be resolved to run all chances and play the Polignac game here, which is not quite out of the question, for if any Reform shall be obtained the people will feel their force, and will at last frighten the whole body of the aristocracy into desperate measures. At least this is not altogether off the cards. For the present a mixed Administration will be chosen. Lord Grey has been sent for, and he will be Prime Minister I suppose.

November 17.—I find that folks are angry with me for pushing Ministers on Monday night. Tavistock told me at Brooks's that he *had been defending me*, and had quoted Fox, who called the Administration that was outvoted about Melville's trial, a disgraced Administration.

Now I know friend Tavistock very well, and am aware that, with all his good qualities, he is not ill read in the "school for scandal." 'Tis rather too hard the Whigs should affect to be angry with me; that the other side should I can well understand, and they are shy enough.

November 18.—Burdett saw Lord Grey yesterday, and was much pleased with his frankness, promising Reform and all good things as the basis of his Administration.

I went down to the House of Commons, and found the expiring Ministers in their places

attending to a discussion on the new police force. 1830.
This is one of Peel's creations, and he seemed much pleased with the testimonies in their favour.

November 19.—At Brooks's, where our friends were handing about a list of the new Administration. Brougham Lord Chancellor!! Reform of Parliament, Anti-Slavery, Law Reform, Useful Knowledge Society, *Edinburgh Review*, Sublime Society of Beef Steaks, hail and farewell!! But it is believed, and people seem glad to get rid of my learned friend from the House of Commons. He came. We set up a shout, and he soon went away.

Of all the rumoured nominations, Sir J. Graham, First Lord of the Admiralty strikes me as the most preposterous.

Lord Durham (the Privy Seal) had a long talk with me, and said all was going on well and nearly settled.

He assured me that Lord Grey based his Administration on Reform of Parliament, and next on retrenchment. He would not have useless placemen for the sake of influence. In that case I told him if Lord Grey was turned out in a month he would come in again in a month. I told Durham they should get some friend of Government to put off Brougham's Reform motion, and take it up as a Government measure. He said, "Thank you; it is a very good thought." My Lord is acting the Cabinet Minister already.

1830. Indeed, I hear that he has ordered his Windsor uniform and two or three additional footmen.

November 21.—Tavistock tells me that Holland House is alive with talk. Lady Holland and Allen are distributing the Church patronage of the Duchy of Lancaster already, and act and think as if they were in the days of the Pelhams and Walpoles, with perfect tranquillity and self-complacency.

Very different are the sights and sounds in the country. Four or five counties are in a blaze, and The Grange, Alexander Baring's mansion, has been all but taken by storm, and Bingham Baring, attempting to seize a rioter, knocked down by a sledge-hammer.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

November 22.—At the House of Commons this day the old Ministers took their seats on the Opposition benches—Peel, Hardinge, Calcraft, Scarlett, and all. I ascended to my mountain behind them, with Hume, Warburton, John Wood, Marshall, and a few others of the same stamp.

I went to the House of Lords to see Brougham. There was a great crowd on the steps of the Throne and below the Bar—men and women. At five o'clock, whilst I was talking with the Swedish Minister, some one said, "There he is!" and, looking round, I saw my Lord had stepped in, almost unobserved, and had taken his seat on the Woolsack.

I heard Lord Grey speak. He made a declaration of the principles on which his Government was formed—very fair and explicit, so it seemed to me. Brougham was the observed of all—presiding in an assembly of dignitaries, spiritual and temporal, whom he had for a quarter of a century endeavoured to render contemptible. He did not look quite comfortable, nor know what to do. I heard him turn to his pursebearer and say, “What am I to say?” Lord Lyndhurst walked up to the Woolsack and shook hands with the new Chancellor; not quite cordially, I thought. 1830.

I returned to the House of Commons, and heard a discussion on the state of the country. Baring made no secret of his great alarm; and Peel said that every man should be prepared to *fight* for his property, which sounded rather oddly to those who knew what sums we paid for the protection of our lives and properties by the Government.

The alarm became more general and more serious every day. The news from Wiltshire was very bad, and riotous assemblages in Hampshire had been dispersed and eighty prisoners made by a military manœuvre, the credit of which was given to no less a personage than the Duke of Wellington, with what truth I knew not. But, in spite of these unhappy disturbances, the course of life in London ran pretty much as usual.

1830. FROM DIARY.


November 25.—I had a long talk with Burdett about the state of the country. He is for strong measures, such as declaring the counties out of the King's peace, re-enacting the Alien Act against foreigners, who are supposed to be at the bottom of the burnings, etc. And, above all, arm the householders.

November 26.—I hear that Brougham, in a judgment delivered in Chancery, has hinted that his new character will preclude him from his previous convivial habits.

November 28.—At the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. My Lord Chancellor Brougham and Vaux, the chairman, came and transacted business as usual, with much speed and accuracy. The company, consisting of some of the most scientific men in the kingdom, seemed proud of their patron and founder. Indeed, it is somewhat a wonderful sight to see such a man in such a place.

November 29.—I had a long talk with Place on the state of the country. He thinks a revolution inevitable. The farmers of Kent and Sussex have for the most part acceded to the demands of the labourers, and will pay so long as they can. When they cannot, the parson and the landlord will be obliged to contribute. The first will be treated with the least ceremony.

November 30.—Went to the Royal Society's chambers, where the Presidency was contested



ELIZABETH, THIRD LADY HOLLAND.

From the picture by Robert Fagan at Holland House. By kind permission of
Mary, Countess of Ilchester.

between Herschel and the Duke of Sussex. The merits of the candidates seem to be that the first has no quality but one—science; the last has every quality but one—science. I voted for the Duke, who carried the election only by nine. 1830.

December 3.—A deputation from the Metropolitan parishes waited on me respecting my Vestry Bill, the essential clause of which displeases them, so all my labour has been in vain. This is the fate of most men who try to reconcile contending interests. Thankless Metropolis! My bones shall not rest in either of your cemeteries!

December 4.—Lord Tavistock told me at Brooks's yesterday that he was going to Lord Althorp to propose that not less than one hundred seats shall be remodelled by the proposed Reform. He says that Althorp wants encouragement, as he stands almost alone in the Cabinet, so far as efficient Reform is concerned. I fear so.

December 10.—Called on Lord Holland. Saw him and his awful lady. I thought he had rather a ministerial air; he talked of Cabinets and messengers in waiting, and was more than usually reserved. We had a few words about Reform, which seemed to alarm Lady Holland, but my Lord confessed the time was come and it must be done. He told me that the Duke of Wellington last night in the Lords completely let out the "malus animus" against proceedings in France, talking of misfortune and bad example, of events of last summer to which he sagely

1830. attributed the disturbances in England. That and his complaint of the procession of Trades parading to the Palace on Wednesday last are very little to his honour.

December 11.—Walked about with Burdett, who tells me that a story goes of Lady Jersey having told the Queen that in the present Cabinet there is not one man who has any religion. What did my Lady think of the Duke of Wellington's religion?

December 13.—I attended Parliament, and, in a short speech, made a sort of profession of faith. I pointed out to the new Ministers the necessity of listening to the people, and not taking the advice of those false or foolish friends who daily urged the propriety of keeping up establishments and continuing high salaries—*e.g.* Ridley Colborne, who compared the public to a "great gentleman." I said that I could not doubt of the good intentions of Ministers, particularly Althorp, Russell, and Denman, who were opposite; and promised, if they continued as they had begun, my "cordial support."

Warburton and Hume told me I had made a very good speech. I did not care about good or bad so far as speaking went, but I felt a sincere wish to praise, and by praising uphold and encourage the Ministers, without any sacrifice of old principles.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

December 15.—I heard at the House of Com-

mons that Henry Hunt was a good deal ahead of Mr. Stanley, the new Irish Secretary, at Preston. And why was this? Because, as I was told, Mr. Stanley would not pledge himself to vote against the Corn Laws and for the Ballot. Now, although opinions might differ about these proposals, there ought to be no difference of opinion about pledges, nor about the manliness which dictates a refusal to give them. 1830.

In days of commotion and difficulty, public writers and public talkers are often more bitter against individuals than against Governments and parties. Of this, in the days of which I am writing, I had a good proof; for Cobbett was much more savage against myself than against the Ministers, and against individuals in office than against the Cabinet. He said, or wrote, that "he hated Stanley more than any one living; except Sidmouth and his gang, and Burdett and Hobhouse."

The tone of some of our friends was also not at all agreeable. Dr. Bowring went so far as to tell me that he did not think our revolution coming—he thought it had come.

Parliament dissolved till February 3.

FROM DIARY.

December 18.—I dined at Lord Lansdowne's, with some thirteen or fourteen good people, and found very little apprehension of anything happening.

1830. Lord Lansdowne told me he had rather bad news from Wiltshire. The farmers had begun to back out of their compulsory bargains with the labourer.

Edward Ellice confessed to me to-day that he thought the Ministers ought to dissolve the Parliament and appeal to the people at once. I assented most decidedly. He says Lord Grey and Althorp take everything very quietly and look at the best side of all matters, but he apprehends a convulsion.

December 20.—At House of Commons. Peel made a strange speech, half reproving his friends for indiscreet attacks on the new Ministry, and half attacking those Ministers for arrogating to themselves principles which the late Government carried so admirably into effect, *e.g.* retrenchment and peace. He spoke equivocally of the conduct of the French. Hume answered him well, which angered Sir Robert, who said he had not condemned the resistance of the French, but had only said that revolutions were bad when best. Funds had fallen to 57 at Paris. What a sublime discovery!

December 24.—Great alarms at Paris. Polignac and the others condemned to perpetual imprisonment. The people dissatisfied and moving in great masses, but the National Guard and Lafayette, and more than all, the King, by going amongst the people, quieted them.

December 25.—Ministers have been unwise

enough to order a form of prayer to allay the troubles in various parts of the country; although, when Spencer Perceval gave notice of an address to the King to order a general fast for the same object, the other night, there was a horse laugh. Why should Ministers think the people greater fools than the Parliament? 1830.

December 26.—I had a talk with Sir James Graham, who asked me what I thought of public feeling, as he had heard me quoted for an unfavourable opinion on that score. I told him what I thought, and strongly recommended a dissolution of Parliament. "What," said he, "then we are come too late, you think?" A day or two afterwards Sir James spoke, and announced that "Parliament would not be dissolved until Ministers had learnt the feeling of the present House of Commons. If that should prove to be against them, they would appeal to the people." Sir George Clerk sagely observed that, "Perhaps the present Ministers might not have it in their power to do so, as there were two words to that bargain."

January 15, 1831.—I had a visit from Vanderweyer. He had seen Lord Grey, who appeared to have a liking for the Prince of Orange, and asked whether it was possible to make him King of the Belgians. "Certainly," replied Vanderweyer, "with another Revolution—without it, not; and, if chosen, he would be shot out of a window. There are eleven thou- 1831.

1831. sand volunteers who have sworn the death of any prince of the Nassau family who might be placed over them."

January 18.—Dined at Warre's, at Cambridge's house, in Twickenham meadows. Sir R. Inglis there. He seems to think all our troubles, and amongst them the cry for Reform, will subside quietly, and the old Tory principles and practices finally prevail. If he should turn out to be right, what blunderers we are?

January 21.—A letter from Mrs. Kennedy, widow of Dr. Kennedy, whose religious conversations with Lord Byron have been published. This insolent epistle is likely to add to the thousand and one squabbles which my intimacy, and, I may add, my honest and disinterested friendship for Byron, have entailed upon me.

The woman is angry with me for discouraging her from publishing the catch-penny conversations above mentioned: I knowing from Lord Sidney Osborne that Byron was playing upon Dr. Kennedy, whom he used to call Saint Kennedy, in order to distinguish him from another, a very good fellow, whom he called Sinner Kennedy.

January 28.—The day fixed for the Belgians to choose a King, occurrences which now cease to make us stare. The Poles and Russians seem about to begin their mortal strife.

January 31.—Finished the second volume of

Moore's Life of Byron, and am now more pleased 1831.
than ever with the resolution taken by me, of not contributing to that work. Nevertheless, it presents a tolerably fair picture of Lord Byron's real character, and some of Moore's observations are exceedingly just and conveyed in appropriate language. That the letters and journals raise Lord Byron in public estimation as a man of talent, no one will be foolish enough to assert. What then has this publication achieved? It has put £3,500 at least into the pocket of T. Moore. Murray, the publisher, says that he gave Tom Moore £6,000 for the work; but that sum must include expenses for purchasing materials.

February 1.—Received an invitation from Lord Althorp to dine with him at a Parliamentary dinner on February 2. Determined not to go, as I considered it a meeting of Members notoriously supporting the Administration, amongst which number I do not choose to be ranked. I am a friend but no follower, nor ought a Member for Westminster to be; so I wrote to Lord Althorp and told him that my absence in the country would prevent me having the honour of dining with him. So long as I am independent I will be wholly so! From one or two observations I have made, I feel certain that the Ministers or their retainers would be glad enough to secure me or any one by the cheapest of favours.

1831. *February 3.*—I went to the House of Commons at four o'clock, and found it so full that I was scarcely able to get a place.

Lord Althorp announced that Lord J. Russell would bring forward the Cabinet Reform on March 1, and that it would be "full and effectual"; also that the Ministers, one and all, were agreed upon the measure. Here is an answer to the taunt that ten men cannot be found agreeing in one plan. The House seemed more Ministerial than before the recess.

I walked away early with Tavistock, who told me as a most inviolable secret that, of all the Cabinet, Brougham was the one and only one who was afraid that the Reform Measure was going too far. He said there would be no seat left for "a clever young lawyer." However, like a clever old lawyer, now that the measure is resolved upon, he takes care to have it given out he originated it. Tavistock said, had the King stood out against the measure, Brougham would have gone round. The King told Lord Holland the other day that he had a conversation of three hours with Lord Grey on the subject, and was never better pleased in his life.

February 7.—The Civil List scheme is not well received. I had a talk with Sir Henry Hardinge, who said that a general war was inevitable, and that either all the thrones of Europe would fall, or Paris would be a third time taken. This shows the Duke of Wellington's feeling as strongly as

his declaration against Reform, which Hardinge defended as the only line to be taken by a sincere statesman who thought the Monarchy incompatible with Reform. 1831.

From some conversation I had with Peregrine Courtenay,¹ I see that Reform will be opposed at all hazards. P. Courtenay talked of his having lost his domestic comforts by being out of office. To be sure, who wonders at his anxiety to resist Reform.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

February 8.—Mr. Henry Hunt proposed to address the Crown for a reprieve for the convicts sentenced under the Special Commission for trying the rioters in the country. This called forth a wild, disorderly speech from O'Gorman Mahon, but Althorp, who answered the Irish declaimer, said he preferred civil war to the dismemberment of the Empire.

On this day Mr. Spencer Perceval, who had given notice of a motion for addressing the Crown to appoint a day of fasting and humiliation, told me he "believed that such a supplication might bring down on us a special interposition of Providence in our favour, just as Nineveh was saved of old." Feeling how much we English are indebted to fanaticism for our liberties, I did not smile at this; but in after days, when better

¹ Thomas Peregrine Courtenay, M.P. for Totnes, Vice-President of the Board of Trade.

1831. acquainted with this gentleman, I became convinced that, on such subjects, he was not of sound mind, although on all others perfectly rational.

FROM DIARY.

February 12.—Read the Budget. See that the Ministers' project of taxing transfers of stock is furiously opposed as a breach of faith. I should not wonder if Lord Althorp was obliged to give up that scheme. The reduction of the newspaper tax very good, but might be better. To my mind, a graduated property tax would be preferable, and I shall say so.

February 13.—Lord Althorp has again asked me to a Ministerial dinner, which I again think it better to decline.

February 14.—The tax on transfers given up. Attended debate on finance. Althorp announced his intention to give up the tax, as also to abandon the reduction of Tobacco Duties. Several other parts of his scheme attacked, and likely to be given up also. This shows the imprudence of having delayed Reform. Lord Tavistock told me that his brother John urged the necessity of bringing on the great question early, and the 17th of this month was fixed, but the Cabinet changed the day.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

February 15.—I attended the Committee on the reduction of official salaries. Lord Chancellor

Brougham was examined at his own request. He came into the room with the Mace and the Great Seal, and, when seated, put on his hat. He told us that his colleagues in the Cabinet had obliged him to change his mode of living. He had wished to continue in his house in Hill Street, but had been forced to go into a larger house in Berkeley Square; also that, instead of his one chariot, he had now two coaches and two chariots, in spite of his earnest remonstrance. When speaking of the retiring pension given to ex-Chancellors, he said he wished to God he could be *dispeered* by Act of Parliament, and return to his profession; but, as that could not be, he had thought of a scheme for increasing the retiring salary, and giving the ex-Minister something to do. Peel was very cool and solemn, and, as usual with him, flirted with Acts of Parliament.

At this time we had news of revolutions, or attempts at revolution, in the Papal States and Modena. To one of these commotions England owes the very best Librarian that ever presided over the literature of the British Museum.

FROM DIARY.

February 15.—Made a speech, and not a bad one, on the extravagant tastes of the late King, and the enormous expense of Windsor Castle. Althorp and Lord John Russell spoke very honestly.

February 17.—I dined in Berkeley Square, and

1831. was too late at the House of Commons to bring on my Vestry Bill, the only time I was ever too late in my life. A sad business!

February 23.—The Finance schemes of Ministers are universally decried, and were it not for Brougham's Chancery Reform and the expected Parliamentary Reform, would turn them out.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

February 24.—This day I was witness to a scene in the House of Commons the like of which, I believe, has never occurred either before or since. After a skirmish between Stanley and O'Connell, the latter made several solemn protestations of wishing to keep the peace in Ireland, whereupon a man in the gallery roared out, "YOU LIE." He was immediately secured by the messengers, and in the course of the evening brought to the Bar. Making but a lame excuse, he was committed to Newgate. It was said that he was mad; but, whether mad or not, there were many of us who believed he spoke the truth.

February 26.—The House, contrary to usage, sat from twelve to six o'clock to receive petitions on the subject of Reform. No one declared positively against all Reform—a circumstance which I could not help remarking at the time, and which was a novelty.

At last came the great day—Tuesday, March 1. I went to the House at twelve o'clock, and found

all the benches, high and low, on all sides, 1831.
patched with names. With much difficulty I
got a vacant space on the fourth bench, nearly
behind the Speaker, almost amongst the Opposi-
tion and the Anti-Reformers.

Lord John Russell began his speech at six
o'clock. Never shall I forget the astonishment
of my neighbours as he developed his plan.
Indeed, all the House seemed perfectly astounded;
and when he read the long list of the boroughs
to be either wholly or partially disfranchised
there was a sort of wild ironical laughter, mixed
with expressions of delight from the ex-Ministers,
who seemed to think themselves sure of recover-
ing their places again immediately. Our own
friends were not so well pleased. Baring Wall,
turning to me, said, "They are mad! they are
mad!" and others made use of similar exclama-
tions,—all but Sir Robert Peel; he looked serious
and angry, as if he had discovered that the
Ministers, by the boldness of their measure, had
secured the support of the country. Lord John
seemed rather to play with the fears of his
audience; and, after detailing some clauses which
seemed to complete the scheme, smiled and
paused, and said, "More yet." This "more,"
so well as I recollect, was Schedule B, which
took away one member from some boroughs that
returned two previously. When Lord John sat
down, we of the Mountain cheered long and loud;
although there was hardly one of us that believed

1831. such a scheme could, by any possibility, become the law of the land.

Sir John Sebright seconded the motion in a short speech. Poor Sir Robert Inglis made a long Anti-Reform speech, and called the Ministerial plan a revolution. Lord Althorp spoke out manfully; Lord L. Gower treated us to some "prose run mad" for an hour or two; and Hume adjourned the debate at half-past twelve o'clock. We all huddled away, not knowing what to think—the Anti-Reformers chuckling with delight at what they supposed was a suicidal project, and the friends of Ministers in a sort of wonderment. I recollect that a very good man, Mr. John Smith, a brother of Lord Carrington's, caused much amusement by saying that Russell's speech made his hair stand on end.

Sir Robert Peel, with his usual quickness and sagacity, took care at the end of the debate to ask for an explanation of the £10 qualification for householders in towns, which certainly partook more of disfranchisement than any other reform, and was calculated to make the whole plan unpopular.

Burdett and I agreed there was very little chance of the measure being carried, and that a revolution would be the consequence. We thought our Westminster friends would oppose the £10 qualification clause; but we were wrong, for we found all our supporters delighted with the Bill.

March 2.—House of Commons. I found the 1831.
tone of the House generally had been very much changed since the previous evening. The scheme was now thought not so very wild. Macaulay made a powerful speech, but his concluding peroration was too long and too laboured. Hunt supported the Bill, but talked like an ass about Ilchester jail; indeed, he is a very silly fellow. Sir Charles Wetherell buffooned for nearly two hours, but was cheered immensely; so that Denman, who very imprudently would speak, could scarcely get a hearing. The debate was adjourned.

March 3.—I had a skirmish with Sir Henry Hardinge before the adjourned debate began, for calling the scheme revolutionary. George Bankes resumed the discussion. "The Lord delivered him into my hands," for he quoted Pitt's speech in favour of the Irish Union, from which I had made extracts, and was enabled to answer him on his own grounds. I flattered myself that I gave him and Wetherell a sufficient dressing. I spoke for an hour and a half, and concluded by apologising to Sir Robert Peel for my exultation on the day of his being beaten out of office, and imploring him to become Reformer. I was not quite pleased with myself, but I heard from all quarters that I had done very well indeed. Peel gave no sign of life when I was speaking; but when he spoke he paid me a handsome compliment, by saying that the assertion that "abilities were not the first requisite

1831. for an M.P. came with a very bad grace from the Member for Westminster." Alexander Baring then made a very efficient although very unfair speech against Reform. He created so much effect that Mr. Charles Ross told me it had changed six votes. I mentioned this to Lord Duncannon, who consoled me by saying that Ross said what was not true; Baring had not gained even his own son by his speech. Lord Tavistock was very indignant with him for saying that Russell had drawn his Bill so as to save the Bedford interest. Palmerston made a very weak speech. Then rose Peel, and made what was a most effective address to the House in favour of the present system; but his speech consisted chiefly of attacks on Palmerston and Russell for inconsistencies, and, when I read it afterwards, I was surprised to find there was so little in it. However, the House rang with cheers when he sat down, and the debate was adjourned immediately at past two in the morning.

March 4.—I went rather late to the House of Commons, but heard Mr. Jeffrey,¹ the new Lord Advocate, speak for an hour and three-quarters. His fluency and argumentative powers were admirable; but he was too quick and too close for a popular assembly such as our House of Commons. I must not omit to record that Mr.

¹ Francis (afterwards Lord) Jeffrey, editor of the *Edinburgh Review* from its foundation in 1803 till 1829; Lord Advocate, 1830-34; M.P. for Malton and then for Edinburgh; Judge of the Court of Session, 1834.

Stanley made so excellent a speech that those near me whispered he ought to be our leader. The debate was adjourned to the following Monday. 1831.

Saturday, March 5.—I dined with Mr. Speaker, at a mixed Ministerial party, for the first time in the ten years that I had been in Parliament. After dinner I had a long conversation with Alexander Baring. I told him that, in my opinion, Reform would be inevitably carried. He surprised me by saying he supposed it would; and that, if the people showed a determination for it, he should not continue his opposition. He expressed regret for his attack on Russell, but added that he could not help thinking that some great family influences were spared by the measure, whilst others were sacrificed. I thought him a strange compound—a timid yet extravagant politician; practically kind and friendly, but in debate ferocious and unfair. He was said to wish for a peerage, and some added that, if he did not get it from Lord Grey, he would get it from the Duke of Wellington, or any one else.

March 7.—At House of Commons. The adjourned debate on the Reform Bill became rather tiresome, and did not seem likely to come to an end, for I counted no less than fifteen Members on their legs at once, attempting to catch the Speaker's eye. I stayed, however, until past one, and then went away with Lord Durham. He said he wished to speak to me about a subject to

1831. which he had alluded in the month of November last. He said that Lord Grey would like to know whether I would take office. As a vacancy had now occurred, he wanted to be informed what my answer would be, if asked to fill it. I replied that, since Lord Grey had brought forward his Reform Bill, I could have but one object, namely, to support him in any way he might think desirable.

March 9.—Lord John Russell closed the debate by an excellent speech at exactly twenty-five minutes to one o'clock on the morning of March 10; the Speaker put the question, that “LEAVE BE GIVEN TO BRING IN A BILL TO AMEND THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE IN ENGLAND AND WALES.” The friends of the Bill gave a great shout for the “AYES,” and only two “NOES” were heard. “And I have lived to witness this—the greatest event, for good or for evil, that has occurred since the Revolution of 1688; in some respects greater even than that.” This was the entry I made in my diary. The Irish and Scottish Reform Bills were also brought in after short debates, which lasted till three in the morning.

FROM DIARY.

March 10.—The feeling in the country is all but unanimous in favour of Reform. Never before were the Whigs bold, nor the Reformers prudent. The King answered the City Address yesterday in most decisive terms.

March 12.—I dined at Lord Althorp's in Downing Street. Lord Althorp told us that, just before the Debate on March 1, he told Stanley the plan of Reform in order that he might be prepared to speak. Stanley was so surprised that he burst into an incredulous laugh, but recovered himself by degrees, and agreed to do as he was bid. Lord Althorp remarked that if Peel had been wise he would have spoken immediately after Russell, and would have endeavoured to negative the introduction of the Bill at once. 1831.

Tavistock told me that Brougham was doing all sorts of mischief in the Cabinet; that he had tried to prevent Lord J. Russell from accepting office, and afterwards endeavoured to prevent him from bringing in the Reform measure. I can believe anything of the man.

March 13.—I read a good deal of Dryden's delicious prose; a great relief from Vestry Bills and Cotton Factory Bills.

March 18.—I went to the House of Commons, which I found quite full, debating timber duties. A great whip against Ministers, and although Lord Althorp withdrew his original tax on Canadian timber, and took off duty on Baltic, it would not satisfy those who had resolved at all hazards to get a vote *against* Ministers. We divided, and were beat by 46.

The enemy were in ecstasies, laughed, clapped hands, and gave every sign of delight. Our Benches gave a horse laugh which rather dis-

1831. comforted them, but they were still in absolute hysterics of joy.

Sir Charles Forbes took occasion to abuse the Reform Bill as revolutionary, on which I said a word or two; and Forbes replied by asking me when I should ask Ministers about resigning. This moved me, and I gave him a good dressing, and took occasion to expose the vote of the night as a poor paltry trick, which would deceive nobody out of doors and would not affect Reform. The Speaker remonstrated with me privately for using strong language, but I was right, I repeat it: the vote was got up against Reform, not against the Timber Duties.

March 19.—I dined with Lord Grey in Downing Street. A large party of twenty-five, all M.P.'s. Very different from Lord Grey's modest *ménage* in Berkeley Square.

I happened to sit next to Lord Grey at dinner, and had a great deal of talk with him. He was out of spirits with the vote of the night before, and seemed to think it would affect Reform. He told me that nothing could exceed the excellent, open conduct of the King; that His Majesty had a conference of three hours on framing the Reform measure; and that it was a conversation of question and answer, not of mere listening, as it used to be in the time of George IV. The King was decidedly for Reform. He had been displeased with one measure only, and that was the interference with his household.

As that was a saving of only £12,000 a year, Lord Grey thought it was not worth while to quarrel with him for that sum, and he asked me to speak to Hume about it. 1831.

Lord Grey told me that he was aware, from the beginning, that he had only one thing to do—namely, to give a measure which would satisfy the people. As for the borough proprietors, they could not be satisfied.

He said that Lauderdale was once so violent a Reformer that he called the Duke of Richmond the greatest apostate that ever lived, except General Arnold. The Duke called him out, and Grey was his second, but no fight took place. Then Arnold called him out, and there was a duel, in which Mr. Fox was second to Lauderdale.

Lord Grey is an over-anxious man, more in manner perhaps than in action. He was rather fussy at the head of his table as to the dinner and waiting. But his kind and generous nature appears through all his talk; no one can doubt his sincerity. In this respect he has little of the statesman in him.

Talking of the infatuation of the other party, he told me that the Duke of Wellington, when some one said to him there might be a conflict with the people, exclaimed, "Ah, bah!"

I was very glad to hear from Lord Duncannon this evening, one of the three Ministers who had drafted the Reform Bill, that the Cabinet was

1831 resolved, in case of necessity, to dissolve the Parliament.

This somewhat consoled me for the complaints I heard from Lord Nugent and Poulett Thomson, who told me that it was impossible to go on with such Cabinet Ministers as Graham, and Grant, and Palmerston, who either would not or could not speak. Grant does not attend often, and when he does he is half asleep. In the meantime Lord Grey complains of his House of Commons Treasury Bench suffering such men as Herries to roll them in the kennel without reply.

March 21.—Lord J. Russell moved the second reading of his Reform Bill in the House this evening, and the debate went on till past two in the morning.

March 22.—The debate on the Reform Bill was resumed. The rumours were rather more in favour of our success than they had previously been. Hume and Holmes compared lists, and brought them almost to an equality. But some votes were still doubtful. Acland, as usual, spoke at two, amidst loud roars of Question! Russell replied, and Peel looked as if he was going to speak, but we prepared to give him a reception on both sides had he done so unfair a thing.

The gallery was cleared, and at exactly three minutes to three in the morning the Speaker put the question on Sir Richard Vyvyan's amendment, "That the Bill be read a second time this day

six months." The shouts of Ayes and of Noes 1831.
were tremendous.

For some time we in the House appeared the strongest, but by degrees our ranks were thinned, and we thought we were beaten. Lord Maitland ran up to me and told me the numbers in the lobby were 309, but shortly after he returned, pale and breathless, and said, "You have it." And so we had, for there were only 301 against us; and when the Tellers approached the table, and ours were on the right, we burst into tumults of delight, clapping hands, waving hats, and shouting lustily with all our might. I was in raptures—not foolish, I hope; for I said and thought that the vote had saved the country. I crossed the House, and shook hands with Althorp, Graham, and Russell, all of whom seemed delighted with the measure. The defeated party put a good face on the matter, and, as William Peel said to me, bore their beating with good humour.

March 23.—Passed the day in giving and receiving congratulations.

March 24.—There was another debate on presenting the Irish Reform Bill. Peel made the speech he ought to have made on the English Bill. Palmerston answered feebly. I think I could have done it better, for he did not lay hold of the weak points, especially in Sir H. Hardinge's silly and impudent speech. Peel declared strongly against the Bill, and yet threw out a hint that either that or some Reform was inevitable.

1831. *March 25.*—We had a long debate on the Civil List. Althorp proposed to give £12,000 more than recommended by the Civil List Committee. I tried to do what I could with Hume, who in the most laughable way seemed to assent and yet objected to the increase. R. Gordon made a most mischievous speech, and Ministers got into a hobble. There was, however, no division, though we sat up till past three in the morning. Nothing but Reform can give these men a chance of keeping their ground.

March 30.—A new writ moved for Parnell, who has accepted the Secretaryship of War. It is a good appointment. He is a much better man *there* than I should have been; but I am a better man in the House, at least so far as speaking goes.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

March 31.—I walked some time with Sir Henry Hardinge, a man with whom I became afterwards officially connected, and whom I never think of without feelings of affection and esteem. He told me that he despaired of any effectual opposition to the Reform Bill, and thought the Ministers firm in their places. He spoke despondently of his own situation, and said that he could not bear to see a child in the street, as it reminded him of the three that he had at home, who might be exposed to the same wants. Formerly he had no such feelings—meaning, I suppose, when he

was in office and his party triumphant. I came 1831.
to the conclusion that these good men thought their offices were a permanent provision for them, and their acrimonious hostility to the new Ministers was not to be wondered at. Yet he was not over-pleased with his own party, and confessed to me that Sir Robert Peel's manners and general bearing disqualified him for a Parliamentary leader.

On April 3 I again dined with Lord Grey. There was a large party at his table, and amongst them Count Walewski, a Pole and a reputed son of Napoleon. He had just come from Poland with the passport of a French comedian. He was in the battle of Praga, of which he gave some details. The upper part of his face was very like what I recollected of Napoleon's; so like that Lady Holland, in an absent fit, could not help saying to him, "You are very like your father"; on which he replied, "I did not know that you were acquainted with my father." After dinner I had a little talk with Lord Grey about the Poles. He told me that he considered the cause as hopeless, in spite of their heroic efforts, adding that, although he could not receive Wielopolski in his public capacity, he should be glad to see him as a private gentleman, just as he did Count Walewski, in consequence of a letter he had received from Prince Czartoryski.

CHAPTER XI

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

1831. *April*.—All sorts of rumours were afloat, and stories, more or less absurd, were told, during the discussions on the first Reform Bill. I recollect that Lord Durham informed me Ministers were sure of a majority in the Lords if the Bill passed the Commons—a very great mistake.

Andrews, the Bond Street bookseller, told me that Lord Sidmouth had been with him to know the feelings of those in his class of life, and his lordship would not believe that the majority of them were not against the measure. The truth was that, of the tradesmen who had any political opinion at all, the feelings were all but unanimous in favour of Parliamentary Reform. Of course those who looked only to an increase of wealthy customers preferred that all things should remain as they were.

FROM DIARY.

April 6.—Dined at Lord Belhaven's. Met Sydney Smith there; he very agreeable and good-natured, as usual. I was introduced to Lady Charlemont, a very handsome woman, but not so

handsome as Lady Tullamore, who also dined with us. Lady Davy there. I have lately read some of her husband's "Last Days"—a strange work, I think: but that a dying man should write at all is more strange. 1831.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

On April 18 a trial of strength between Ministers and their opponents was expected, for General Gascoyne was to move that the number of knights, citizens, and burgesses for England and Wales ought not to be diminished.

At the House, Lord John Russell opened the debate by explaining the changes that had been made since the second reading of the Bill. These changes did not at all affect the principle of the measure, but only rectified unavoidable errors. Then Gascoyne moved his amendment in a violent and foolish speech. He afterwards confessed to me that his motion had been agreed upon as the best way of defeating the Reform Bill; yet this was denied by him, and by others, in the course of the debate.

Lord Althorp declared that the Government had resolved to consider the decision of the House on this motion as final with respect to the Bill.

The next day, April 19, I went to the House. A tall, ungainly young man, with a strong squint of one eye, spoke with great fluency and precision during nearly an hour, gaining much upon his audience, until the House became quite silent.

1831. His name was Hawkins, a nephew of my late friend Sir Christopher Hawkins. He was for the Bill, and he made one of the best speeches, certainly the best first speech, I ever heard in Parliament. All sides were pleased with him, but Sir Robert Peel, according to his usual practice, continued turning over the pages of the amended Bill, apparently unmoved and inattentive. We cheered the maiden orator on sitting down tremendously.

Sir Robert Wilson came forward with more boldness, and, it must be confessed, with more eloquence, than usual, and made the most disgraceful exposure that ever closed a life of pretended patriotism. It was a speech full of mischief and malice, and at the end of all his vituperation he declared he should not vote at all.

Peel began his speech in a tone of much moderation and mildness, warmed himself up by degrees, and concluded by a denunciation of Ministers as persons who, if they could not govern, had resolved to make it impossible for others to govern. He attacked the People, he attacked the Press, and had the air of a person who thought victory certain. Indeed, Hume and others told me that we were beaten, but no one knew by how many; some said thirty, some ten.

We divided at half-past four. The excitement was not so great as at the second reading. It was soon conjectured that we were defeated, but

Mr. Planta told me by not more than ten. The Duke of Cumberland was shut up in Mr. Mitchell's office, and grinned at us through the oval window like an old lion. He had attended all the debates on the Bill. 1831.

When the doors opened we heard we were beaten by eight. Sir James Graham said to me, "Well, never mind; then we must have it the other way; the process will be longer, that's all." The division was announced in silence, as agreed upon by our opponents, who did not appear very triumphant.

The next day I spoke to some of our opponents, and they seemed to hope that the Ministers would not resign nor go on with their Bill, by which process it was certain they would finally lose their places and their characters. Our wishes, of course, were for a dissolution of Parliament, and perseverance with Reform.

FROM DIARY.

April 21.—When I entered the House of Commons to-day it appeared the reality of the dissolution had just been known. It produced the greatest consternation in the enemy, which by degrees was inflamed into rage. Peel preserved his temper, but looked exceedingly foolish.

Sir R. Vyvyan solemnly asked Althorp whether he intended to abandon the Reform Bill and to dissolve the Parliament. To these questions Lord Althorp answered very coolly, "Yes, as to the

1831. first; and, as to the second, his duty commanded him to decline to give any answer." On this the friends of Ministers set up a laugh and a shout, and the House seemed on the point of separating, so I went away. But a violent debate sprang up afterwards, on which Maurice Fitzgerald, Peel, and Baring made strong speeches against the Bill and against dissolution, and William Bankes adjourned the House at one o'clock to prevent the Ordnance Estimates from being reported and so to stop the dissolution.

In the Lords, Lord Wharncliffe gave notice that he should move to address the King next day not to dissolve Parliament.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

April 22.—I now learnt that the King, who at first had thought of adjourning the House by Commission, was now resolved to come in person, which, it seems, he ought to do, in order to thank the Parliament for granting the Civil List. By half-past two the House of Commons was very full, and Mr. Speaker was in his gala robes. There was time to report some Bills—my Factory Bill amongst them. Then up got Sir R. Vyvyan, and made a speech in which he attempted to do all possible mischief to Ministers, and all the good to himself and party that time would allow. He deprecated the dissolution, called upon the Protestant electors in the three kingdoms to be on their guard, and announced a revolution

1831.

as certain. He got warm and excited as he went on, and continued in a strain of violence that called up Burdett, who spoke to order. This was natural, but not discreet, in my colleague, for the Speaker decided there had been no breach of order, and Sir Richard resumed his philippic. Then Tennyson called him to order, and the Speaker again protected him. Tennyson disputed the decision of the Chair, and the noise and confusion began to be overpowering. Vyvyan again spoke; the cannons announced the approach of the King, and at each discharge of the guns the Ministerialists cheered loudly, as if in derision of the orator's solemn sentences. At last the roaring of the cannon, the laughter, and our cheering fairly beat the Baronet, and he suddenly sat down.

Peel, quite beside himself, now jumped up; so did Burdett. The Speaker, not quite fairly, called on Peel, and Lord Althorp rose. The calls for Peel, Burdett, Althorp, and Chair now were heard in wild confusion. The floor was covered with Members; half the House left their seats, and the Opposition seemed perfectly frantic; William Bankes looked as if his face would burst with blood; Peel stormed; the Speaker was equally furious; Lord Althorp stood silent and quite unmoved. At last the Speaker recovered himself and said, "I am quite sure I understand what the noble Lord moves—he moves that Sir Robert Peel be heard." Althorp assented, and,

1831. after some more shouting and screaming, Sir Robert Peel was heard. His "speech"—it was thus I recorded it at the time—was such as completely unmasked him: all his candour, all his moderation, all his trimming, shifty policy disappeared, and he displayed his real vexation, and true feelings of disappointment and rage, in an harangue of sound and fury, signifying nothing but his own despair, and hatred of those who had overreached him by calculating on the good sense of the People, and the firmness of the King, with more accuracy than himself. The Black Rod cut short his oration just as he seemed about to fall into a fit. Then the Speaker, with a face equally red and quivering with rage, rose, and, followed by many Members, went to the Lords. Whilst Peel was speaking, I, who was opposite to him, on the second bench behind Ministers, was so much moved at his violence, that I waved my hand and shook my head, as if to show him, in no unfriendly manner, that he was doing harm to himself, and injuring the character of the country. Indeed, I was more sorry than angry; I could hardly have supposed such an incident possible. But Peel was not the only over-excited performer on that day; for Sir Henry Hardinge crossed the House, and said, "The next time you hear those guns they will be shotted, and take off some of your heads. I do not mean yours," said he to me, "for you have been always consistent; but those gentle-

men," pointing to the Ministers. The Speaker returned and read the Royal Speech at the table—it was an admirable speech indeed. 1831.

Lord Althorp, Sir James Graham, and myself walked away together, and stopped to see the King pass the door of the hat-room. He was much cheered; but the crowd was not great. Lord Althorp said to me, "Well, I think I beat Peel in temper"; as, indeed, he had most completely.

We were joined in Palace Yard by Lord Goderich, who told us that the scene in the House of Lords had been more disgraceful than that in the Commons. Lord Londonderry had shaken his fist at the Duke of Richmond; and the Lord Chancellor had been hooted by the Opposition Peers when he left the woolsack, and Lord Shaftesbury had been voted into his seat. Lord Tankerville told me that the angry Lords would, without the least scruple, have voted off the Ministers' heads that day. All this fury was not surprising when we remember that the party who had been in possession of power so long now saw that their hold on that power, through the borough system, was about to leave them—never to return. The firmness of the King had dispelled the last illusion of the anti-Reformers, who, to do them justice, did not give way until all resistance was hopeless.

There was great rejoicing amongst our friends; and the joy at the unexpected triumph of the

1831. Reform party was manifested by him who had contributed to it more than any one else. Robert Grosvenor, Comptroller of the Household, told me that, being sent for in a hurry to attend the King, he found His Majesty in great spirits. When in the House he insisted on putting on the crown himself, and said to Lord Grey, "This shall be my only coronation." Lord Grey apologised to him for the unavoidable haste of the proceeding. "Never mind that," replied His Majesty, "I am always at single anchor." Lord Albemarle, Master of the Horse, told him that the state coachman was not in the way. "Then," said the King, "I will go in a hackney coach."

On the evening of the day on which the King prorogued the Houses, I was waited upon by our Westminster friends, requesting me again to be put in nomination for the City and Liberties.

The next day I attended an assembly at Lansdowne House, and was assured by the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Lansdowne, and others, that the reports of that strange commotion in the Lords were not at all exaggerated. The room was quite full of beautiful women and idle men, with no signs of approaching revolution in the faces of any of them. There were, however, none of our opponents nor their families there.

Parliament was dissolved in the *Gazette* of April 23. The news from the country was very encouraging, and the greatest enthusiasm prevailed in the metropolis. A Westminster meeting

took place in Covent Garden, to address His Majesty and thank him for dissolving the Parliament. It was one of the largest meetings I ever saw assembled in that place, where I had seen so many crowds. Sir Francis Burdett and myself were received as in days of yore. Our speeches were rather peppery, it must be confessed, but they suited the taste of the day.

The next day I attended a meeting at the Crown and Anchor, for establishing a Fund to assist Reform candidates. I proposed the plan agreed upon; we formed a Committee on the spot. Edward Ellice gave me the list of certain influential members of Brooks's Club who had put down their names for sums amounting already to £15,000, a good deal of which had been disposed of in procuring seats for some good men and true. This appeared somewhat in contradiction to the principles on which we put forward our political pretensions; but we were obliged to fight our opponents with their own weapons, no other mode of warfare would have had the slightest chance of success. Subscriptions poured in by sums amounting to thousands of pounds.

May 2.—Sir Francis Burdett and myself went in procession to Covent Garden. Our reception was very gratifying; and we ascended the hustings amidst such thunders of applause as have been seldom heard even there. There had been rumours of opposition, but they turned out alto-

1831. gether unfounded. Indeed, an opposing candidate would have run some personal risk. As it was, the utmost good humour prevailed throughout the vast assemblage.

May 3.—This day Sir Henry Hardinge accosted me by saying that I had been using strong language in my speech of April 26 in reference to Sir Robert Peel, and that Sir Robert Peel had come up from Staffordshire in consequence of it. I understood by this that what was in those days called a meeting might take place, and I answered accordingly. I went to Lord Dacre, and asked him to stand my friend on the occasion. He said he would provided I gave him discretion how to act; he would not if he was called in merely to load pistols. I went home and read the speech complained of in the *Times*. There was nothing in it of which Peel had a right to complain.

Lady Julia had been seriously ill; and as it was of the utmost consequence that she should not be disquieted, I was not a little disturbed when I saw Sir Henry Hardinge approaching my house. I had, however, time to leave the room in which I was sitting with my wife, and to receive him alone in the dining-room. He gave me a letter from Sir Robert Peel, and said that the business would be finished in five minutes. I remarked that I could give no opinion on that point. He went away, and at parting he said, "Well, God bless you, at any rate!"

Peel complained of two sentences in my speech.

One of them I did utter; the other I did not. I was preparing to go to Cambridge to vote at the University election; and it was arranged that, if a meeting took place, it should be near Dover, so that I need not come back to London, but travel at once to the coast.

I went to Cambridge, and dined with Dr. Davy at Caius College. Mr. Otter, of Jesus College, and Barnes, editor of the *Times*, were at this most agreeable dinner, when we did not fail to congratulate each other on the news which came pouring in to us from all parts of the country of the victories of our friends.

The next day I had a letter from Lord Dacre, telling me that the Peel affair had been settled in a manner which he said was quite satisfactory. After voting for Palmerston and Cavendish I returned to London, and called immediately on Lord Dacre. He showed me two letters—one from Hardinge to him, and the other from him to Hardinge. Hardinge's letter concluded by congratulating Lord Dacre that the affair had been settled in a manner so satisfactory to Peel and to me.

FROM DIARY.

May 5.—The truth is, that had we met the issue would have done no good to Peel in any possible way. Had any mischief happened to him, what would have become of the party? Had any happened to me, what would the Re-

1831. formers have said? Peel had no right to complain upon the strength of a report only in one paper; and although my words were strong, they did not amount to an insult; and no insult was meant, of course. Probably Peel wrote in a passion from Drayton, and could not recall his letter. Hardinge showed Lord Dacre letters he had received from Peel, in which his rage was very violent indeed. "*Sic finita est fabula*," for the present at least; but there will be ink shed, and blood shed too, before all is over. "*Hæc inter*," Reform is victorious everywhere.

May 9.—I dined at the Livery Reform dinner, London Tavern, to celebrate return of four City Members. The London Members are very poor creatures. Waithman said that he had "fought with beasts at Ephesus."

Day after day fresh triumphs. My brother and I made out that our majority will be 120 at least.

May 12.—Everything going on well. Indeed, except Bucks and Shropshire, we have been defeated nowhere; and have not lost even there. Scotland and Ireland are doing well; but not so well as merry old England!

May 18.—Nearly all the elections over; but the fight still kept up in Northamptonshire, where the enemy are trying to show that Lord Althorp has behaved with duplicity. This is Tory tactic: when you cannot oppose a man's politics, belie his character.

May 21.—I have been staying with my brother at Send since May 14. I doubt whether Reform has made much progress in these parts. The new M.P. is one of those old courtiers who inquires only what the King wishes. Of these I hear there are still many in the country, though the race is nearly extinct in London. 1831.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

May 23.—I attended the annual Westminster dinner. There were about 300 guests, and the whole festival went off with a spirit and effect to be expected from the prospect of an immediate triumph for the cause of which, after all, Burdett and the Westminster Reformers had been the principal, and, for a time, were the only promoters. Burdett, at the end of the evening, proposed the health of "THOMAS HARDY." The worthy veteran returned thanks, and expressed, as well he might, his amazement at living to see the King and his Ministers propose to do that, for attempting which he had been tried for his life.

At Brooks's I heard from Ellice that Lord Grey was in high health and spirits, and that the Peers would not be able to resist the popular feeling and the large majorities in the Commons.

The King having given a supernumerary Garter to Lord Grey, I wrote to congratulate him, and added that nothing good or honourable could happen to him without the country gaining some advantage from it.

1831. Replying to my letter, Lord Grey told me that conferring the Garter on him was the spontaneous act of the King, who said he thought it of importance to grant him the honour at this moment as a public mark of his favour.

At this time Lady Julia was attacked by that disease which was fated to be so calamitous to my family. The symptoms were such as I could not mistake, and I removed her at once to London for advice. I now found by sad experience how little all public concerns appear compared with an object of domestic interest. I tried to occupy myself with many matters that used to engage my eager attention; and I tried to think of everything but that which pressed most upon all my thoughts. Of the first medical advisers we called in, the report was favourable; but, when I consulted Dr. Warren, he pronounced a sentence which was all but fatal. I shall not record the varieties of this treacherous disorder. The courage and gaiety of the dear creature were such as to keep hope alive, although at times her very patience added to my suffering; and, when she talked of our little projects for the future, I could hardly master my feelings. Once she said, "If this cough would but leave me; but I ought to suffer something—I have been too happy!"

At this time, also, my father became seriously ill, and his house, as well as my own, was a house of sickness and of sorrow. But attendance on

Parliamentary duties was more of a distraction than a burthen to me, and I did my best to conceal my anxieties from my political associates. 1831.

June 21.—Parliament was opened to-day. A vast and well-dressed crowd received His Majesty most enthusiastically. The roofs of the houses near the Admiralty and Horse Guards, and all the way down to Palace Yard, were covered with spectators. In the streets the sight was still more striking, and the multitude was so densely packed that I had some difficulty in getting down to the House.

The King's Speech was more than of the average length, and was eked out by allusions to the cholera. No notice was taken of the result of the elections. Peel made a speech which I characterised at the time as "quite worthy of him," professing candour and moderation, but losing no opportunity of saying sly and injurious things of his opponents. He did just confess that the People had declared for a large Reform by a majority; but he attributed this, in great measure, to the excitement raised by the use of the King's name, and by accusing the late Parliament of refusing the supplies, which he declared to be untrue, and he charged the Lord Chancellor and Sir James Graham with the falsehood in terms scarcely measured. He concluded by declaring that, although in a minority, he should brave unpopularity by opposing Reform as before.

1831. Going away from the House of Commons I looked into the Lords. The array on the Opposition benches was very formidable; but I was consoled by hearing this day, from Samuel Rogers, that the Duke of Wellington had said to him: "They want to make me the head of a faction; but I will not. I have served my country forty years in the field and the Cabinet. I will not now take such a course; and you may tell your Ministerial friends so."

FROM DIARY.

June 23.—For the first time in my life I attended the Speaker of the House of Commons with the Address to the King. We mustered at the House in considerable numbers, 130 or 140. Our Ministers were in their livery, and looked very menial.

I thought the King looked ill. His answer, as usual, was short. He was very attentive to our address, and seemed to wish to show by his movements that he understood and approved of what he heard.

When the Speaker put the address into the King's hand, he knelt on one knee before the throne so that his head was not much above the footstool. This looked a little like Persian adoration, I thought. We all backed out of the room in a throng, the effect of which was not imposing but ridiculous. The King is a good King, the best we ever had.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

1831.

June 24.—This was the day fixed for the introduction of the second Reform Bill, and, although I went down earlier than usual, I found every place taken; and I heard that all the Opposition benches had been occupied since eight in the morning. Being at prayers, however, I did get a seat on the right, below the gangway, amongst the Irish Members. Lord John Russell began his speech at half-past five. He spoke two hours on introducing his new Bill, which seemed to differ very little from the old Bill. Part of his speech was, I thought, good—part of it not so happy. He did not spare the new moderate Reformers, and Peel and Chandos, with their associates, looked a little uncomfortable.

The eccentric Colonel Sibthorp, and Mr. Conolly, M.P. for Donegal, and Lord Stormont were amongst the most obstreperous of the minority. Charles Ross, as usual, was providing materials, fetching books and paper, for Peel. He looked more than usually disconcerted, when Russell mentioned that St. Germans was to be added to the schedule of boroughs to be disfranchised.

Sir Robert Peel followed Russell in a half-angry tone. He promised a division on the second reading, and spoke out most decisively against the Bill, so that, coupling this with the threatening aspect of the Lords, we all expected a most severe struggle.

July 3.—I heard that Prince Leopold had

1831. accepted the crown of Belgium, the wisest choice, not only for Belgium, but all Europe, that could possibly have been made. The same day I dined in company with Achille Murat, eldest son of the late King of Naples, and his wife, some relation of the great Washington. Achille was an insignificant-looking man, with something of the Buonaparte face about his forehead, but he wore spectacles. He talked to me a good deal, and in a most depreciating tone, of Louis Philippe, prophesying that his Government would be overthrown before the next anniversary of the Three Glorious Days. He also foretold that the downfall of the Church and the aristocracy would inevitably follow the Reform Bill. The late heir-apparent of the kingdom of Naples lived in the Alpha Cottages.

Two or three days before this I saw, in the course of a ten minutes' walk, a young man who had lost two crowns; and another personage, not forty years of age, who was very near being Prince Consort of England, was Sovereign of Greece, and was about to be King of Belgium.¹ Dom Pedro² was coming out of the Clarendon Hotel, where he was lodged. Had I gone to Holles Street I should have seen a discrowned

¹ King Leopold.

² Dom Pedro, son of John VI., King of Portugal. Proclaimed Emperor of Brazil in 1822, he was compelled to resign his crown in favour of his son Pedro II. in 1831. In 1833 he recovered by force the throne of Portugal, which had been usurped by his brother Miguel. He died in 1834.

Queen, Hortense, Duchess of St. Leu. A few weeks ago the Duchess of Berri passed through London, and crossed the Duchess of St. Leu on an excursion to Greenwich. Candide's kings at the Carnival of Venice seem no longer a fiction. 1831.

July 4.—The second reading of the new Reform Bill came on. I came in just as Sir James Mackintosh rose. He spoke two hours, and spoke very well indeed—rather “caviare to the general,” but sound and profound. The best speech on the other side was from Lord Porchester. It was rapturously cheered, and, probably, more applauded in reference to the unexpected quarter from which it proceeded, as his father, Lord Carnarvon, had for many years been a strenuous ally of the Whig party.

The young man was applauded and congratulated by all, and Sir Robert Peel said it was by far the best first speech he had ever heard. Lord John Russell said the same. I thought it somewhat strange that Hawkins and his first speech should be so soon forgotten. The debate was adjourned, and I then introduced my Factory Bill.

July 5.—Macaulay made a most effective oration, and was applauded to the skies, particularly towards the end of his speech, when he said that, if this Bill was defeated, Peel would bring in a Reform Bill of his own. Sir Robert winced a good deal, and it was expected would

1831. have followed Macaulay, but William Bankes rose and made one of the most extraordinary exhibitions I had ever seen. He whined, clasped his hands, and put himself into attitudes, concluding one of his sentences thus: "The Lord deliver us out of their hands, I say!" To be sure he was in earnest, for the Bill annihilated the Corfe Castle dynasty.

Lord Althorp followed, and Sir George Murray then spoke. He described the approaching downfall of the monarchy, the rise of another Cromwell, and the degradation of the House of Peers under a Lord Chancellor who would administer to them "Friendly advice," alluding, it was supposed, to a pamphlet with that title, addressed to the Lords, and generally attributed to Brougham.

The debate was resumed the next day, when Peel spoke for more than two hours. The speech, for his purpose, was admirable; and I perceived that some of our converts, Harcourt Vernon for instance, winced under his whipping. He was very dexterous, and comparatively moderate, avowing that, if the feeling for Reform was permanent, he did not see how it could be resisted.

He ended about three in the morning, when Burdett, who for the first time spoke from the floor, answered Peel as well as he could be answered, treating him civilly, but stripping him of some of his details, and putting the question

fairly before the House. Some youngsters opposite tried to put him out by calling "Question," but we cheered him on, and he finished a very effective speech about four o'clock. 1831.

There were 367 in the House, and 231 went out; leaving a majority of 136 in favour of Ministers.

July 9.—There was a banquet at the Mansion House on the occasion of presenting Lord John Russell with the freedom of the City. I was one of the guests at the Mansion House, and must say that it was a very splendid affair. His Majesty Dom Pedro was there. He was a pleasing-looking person.

Lord John Russell occupied the chair next to the Lady Mayoress, and, just as we thought his health was to be given, in came Signor Paganini, in great ceremony, preceded by the stewards of the festival, and, mounting a chair immediately behind Lord Plunket, played a concerto on his violin. I was disgusted, so was Hume; but the company generally were charmed. Reform seemed pretty much forgotten. I confess I felt angry that Burdett should be eclipsed, thinking that, if Reform had anything to do with the feast, he ought of all men to have been somewhat exalted; and I could not help remembering that John Russell had said in Parliament, in 1829, that he would never introduce a Reform motion again; and there he was—with Lord Lansdowne, and such patriots as

1831. Palmerston and the Grants—carrying off all the honours of the day. The kingdom of honest politicians is certainly not of this world.

In the evening of July 10 I received a note from Mr. Brodie, the eminent surgeon, afterwards Sir Benjamin, and President of the Royal Society, informing me that my father was much worse. The next day I did not attend the House, and asked Lord Morpeth to move the second reading of my Factory Bill for me.

July 12.—At House of Commons. The Opposition moved seven or eight adjournments to prevent the Speaker leaving the Chair, and the House sat till seven in the morning, when the Government succeeded in committing the Bill *pro formâ*.

July 14.—The tactics of our opponents were now to create delay by every available stratagem. Even Peel took up great part of an evening on a verbal dispute about leaving out the word *each* before the word *borough*. On this we had a majority of 290 to 193.

The next day I sat until near two in the morning. The debate arose on a motion of Sir Andrew Agnew, for clubbing boroughs instead of disfranchising them. We divided, and had 316 to 205—a majority which satisfied our Ministers, who had previously complained of declining numbers. After a long and desultory conversation, it was at last agreed that our Chairman, Mr. Spring Rice, having read the words “Ald-

borough, Suffolk," the first borough in Schedule A had been disfranchised. So we separated, having, after four nights' debate, accomplished something—but very little.

FROM DIARY.

July 16.—Dined at Mr. Balfour's—a large party. Had some conversation with Lord Maitland and Lord Dudley, on whom I endeavoured to impress the necessity of yielding to the popular wish on the Bill. The first told me the Bill would be thrown out on second reading in the Lords. The latter told me nothing, but I hope I frightened him. He seemed shy of talking on the subject.

July 21.—At House of Commons, where Lord Althorp moved that Reform should precede all business every day at five. Wynne protested violently, and after some words from Goulburn and Milton, our good man gave way, and agreed that there should be an understanding, not a standing order.

Peel took occasion to tell Althorp to trust to his own good sense and good temper, and not listen to the newspapers. This he said in the most insolent and angry tone, which annoyed me, and I had half a mind to reply; but as Althorp bore it, I thought it would be bad taste to try to anger him, but all around me complained of his patience, and indeed our Treasury Bench is over-mEEK.

1831. I heard part of a debate on Bingham Baring's treatment of the Benches.¹ Althorp declared against the part taken by the press in this affair, and was loudly cheered by Peel, who seemed to be appeased during the debate on Reform which followed, for he witnessed the extinction of borough after borough without a word.

July 22.—Sir R. Hardinge told me to-day that the Bill would not pass the Lords, at least not without some compromise. I can hear of no converts amongst the Peers.

July 26.—We finished Schedule A of the Reform Bill after a sort of funeral oration on Wootton-Basset by Lord Porchester, whose chief merit, according to his Lordship, was the having returned Lord Bolingbroke to Parliament. Mr. O'Connell reminded him that it had also returned "Walsh," the swindler. Lord Mahon called this "an indecent personality."

July 29.—We got on so slowly with our Bill that even Lord Althorp became impatient, and said to me, "How the devil shall we get on with our Bill?" I had some conversation also with Stanley, Graham, and Lord John Russell. The latter told me that Brougham was anxious that the Attorney-General should be put forward, and was always grumbling at the delay. It seems he depreciates Macaulay and always extols the

¹ The Bench of Bishops. Lord Grey had appealed to the Bishops to vote for the Bill, telling them that if they did not do so they would become just objects of popular odium.

1831.

Attorney as having made the best speech on the Bill. Sydney Smith says it is because Macaulay is not content with being a moon, but "wants to do a little bit in the *solar line*."

Lord Althorp moved that the House should sit on Saturday. Peel was very angry, and declared he would not do so, but Lord Althorp persevered, and, at three in the morning, carried his point.

July 30.—We got on quietly with Schedule B, PARALYSING, as it was said, borough after borough until we got to Sudbury—a case which, with Totnes, we consented to postpone; and so finished the schedule. William Bankes gave us a "Jeremiad" on Marlborough.

Lord Duncannon told me to-day that it was as much as he could do to keep Althorp and Graham last night to the sticking point. They were wishing to give up. He wished me to tell them what I thought, but when I spoke to Althorp, all he said was, "Do you think so?" Everybody begins to complain of the tone taken by Ministers, who speak as if they were at the head of a minority, both in the House and the country.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

August 1.—I attended the ceremony of opening the new London Bridge by the King and Queen. I passed over Waterloo Bridge, and saw an indescribable sight. The river and the banks

1831. of it were one mass of human beings; but the view from the new bridge itself was still more wonderful. The newspapers gave a very striking and accurate account of the scene. The contrast of the poor old bridge with the magnificent new structure was very striking; and the preparations for receiving their Majesties, and other guests to the number of 1,700, were most superb, and worthy of the metropolis of the civilised world. Captain Basil Hall and Sir Francis Chantrey walked up and down with me, each of us expressing his unbounded admiration of the sight, and I recollect a saying of our great sculptor on this day, that, "of all the countless thousands around us, probably there was not a man who had not a guinea in his pocket." I mentioned this to Burdett just afterwards, and he said, "Does that make for or against Reform?"

The Royal party came about four o'clock. Their procession of boats was almost lost on the bosom of the mighty river; but wherever the small pinnace with the Royal standard was recognised, tremendous cheering and waving of hats and handkerchiefs, and every other demonstration of loyalty and joy, ensued. I was at the head of the corner-table, just at the top of the stairs which the King ascended. His Majesty and the Queen stopped to look down the vista in the long tent, where the company were all standing to receive them. The sight was indeed magnificent, and I heard that our good King confessed that

he had never seen anything like it. I, who had 1831.
seen a great many sights, said the same to those
near me.

After parading to the other end of the bridge, and seeing the balloon go off, their Majesties returned to their seats under the canopy, and the banquet began. Everything went off very well, except that the City sages would have Michael Boai play "God save the King" upon his chin; not quite so musical as Paganini's violin at the Mansion House. The party rose about six o'clock, and the King and Queen returned by water to Somerset House. The procession returned in more splendid order than it came, for it was joined by the great City barges, and the river was covered with boats and flags, and Southwark Bridge looked black with the crowds that covered it. The ceremony of this day was on the whole one of the most successful, and so acknowledged by every one, that our huge metropolis ever witnessed.

The Reform Committee got into Schedule C on August 2; and Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds had two Members given to each of them, after some talk from Peel and Baring, but without a division.

August 3.—Sir Robert Peel made a good speech against giving Members to the Metropolitan boroughs; and, when I came to the House, I found A. Baring speaking on the same side. Lord Althorp called me to him, and said, "Now,

1831. master, you must take off your muzzle to-night." I told him that I had not heard any speech except Peel's. "That will do," said he; and accordingly I went to the third bench behind the Treasury, and, when Baring sat down, rose at once. I recollect that effort with no little pride. It was by far the most successful I had ever made; but it was more to the general question of Reform than to the matter then in debate. There was great cheering when I sat down. Charles Grant handed up a scrap of paper to me, on which was written, "HOW I ENVY YOU!" I folded it up, and have kept it ever since; for my friend was no flatterer, and, being himself a first-rate Parliamentary speaker, his judgment might be depended upon. I received congratulations on all sides, and Mr. Goulburn, who followed me, said that "he had heard me with admiration." I afterwards received civil speeches and messages from men of all parties; yet the reporters made very little of my speech, and, according to the *Times*, Aldermen Wood and Waithman were the foremost men of all that night. However, I hoped that I had done good by taking, and teaching others to take, the right tone. We had a large majority, about 97; much to the disappointment, so I was told, of Sir Robert Peel, who considered our Metropolitan enfranchisements our weakest case; and so it was: London, Westminster, Southwark, and four County Members, were quite enough for all purposes.

1831.

At this time my father became so much worse in health that I requested Dr. Warren to see him. When I heard his opinion, I asked Sir Robert Inglis to get a fortnight's leave of absence for me from the House of Commons. From that day I lived more in Berkeley Square than in my own house.

The last day that my father seemed in complete possession of his senses was August 12. He then asked me how the Reform Bill was going on, and whether all would end peaceably. The last words he uttered to me were, "John, do not let them leave me." "Never be afraid of that," I replied. He then said, "I am not afraid of anything." Mr. Brodie was a great comfort to the family, and tried to persuade my sisters to leave the room; but they would not. They remained with him to the last. He died between six and seven o'clock on August 14. Having watched him when he was in his last agonies, I was astounded at the calmness with which I contemplated him when all was over. His frame was no longer convulsed. The calm of his benignant countenance was unruffled by the moans which had been extorted from him by pain and sleepless weariness. I kissed his cold hand, and cut off a lock of his grey hair.

From the death-bed of my father I was called to attend to my wife, who again had alarming symptoms that induced me to send for Dr. Warren. She was much attached to my father, who was

1831. very fond of her, and the news, which I was compelled to communicate, was doubtless injurious to her. I was present at her last interview with him. I shall never forget the smile with which he bade her farewell!

I shall say no more of him here. Indeed, it would be altogether superfluous, as I have published more than one short Memoir of him; not equal, it is true, to his real merit, nor adequately descriptive of his valuable character, but still, as I hope, sufficient to show my affection and reverence for this good man.

FROM DIARY.

August 28.—To-morrow I return to my abhorred public duty. Not the control of or partaking in any great national concern, which I might undertake with pride and hope; but the dull business of a House of Commons life, and the fruitless endeavour to satisfy selfish, silly, and unreasonable men.

September 7.—Went to the House of Commons, and stayed there to witness the Reform Bill get out of Committee, which it did at about seven o'clock. There were not many Members present, but the Reformers gave a cheer when Bernal left the Chair. I find Members are becoming quite wearied and almost indifferent about the Bill.

September 12.—Burdett told me that Calcraft¹

¹ John Calcraft, M.P. for Dorset, was, like his father, a Whig, but joined the Tories in 1828. He, however, voted for the Reform Bill.

had killed himself. His daughter Arabella left him to go to church; returning, she was told her father had not rung his bell for some time. She waited a little and then went to his room; on opening the door she saw him on the floor with his throat cut, quite dead. The Tories attribute this to remorse; I believe politics had nothing to do with the matter. He had lost his head from excessive worrying, I hear. However, this is the fourth public man who has destroyed himself. 1831.

September 19.—At House of Commons, where I learnt that, owing to some mistake, the Reform Bill had been read a third time without a discussion. A debate arose, however, on the question “that this Bill do pass.” Stanley and Macaulay spoke well; the latter made one of his essays.

September 21.—I attended a Westminster meeting in Covent Garden to petition the Lords to pass the Bill. I saw George Dawson and R. A. Dundas in the balcony opposite—come to spy the nakedness of the land.

The foolish Tories now try to make it believed that the People are beginning to be indifferent. They will pull an old house over their heads, if they do not take care.

FROM BOOK, “RECOLLECTIONS.”

September 21.—I went to the House of Commons. At a quarter to three o'clock Sir Robert Peel rose, and made what was thought a very

1831. brilliant speech, foretelling the downfall of the monarchy and many uncomfortable events. One great mistake he made in reminding the House of the question I had put to him about resigning, but choosing to omit that I had made an apology for that indiscretion. The bad taste and bad feeling of that reminder struck most of us on our side; and when he tried to be smart upon Macaulay, he did not at all succeed, nor did he ever in that line—so that it might be said of him, as Quintilian said of Demosthenes, “*Illi non displicuisse jocos, sed non contigisse.*” He was, however, loudly cheered on sitting down.

We divided at twenty-five minutes past four in the morning. The numbers were declared at five o'clock—346 to 235—and at seven minutes past five the Speaker said, “That Lord John Russell do carry this Bill to the Lords, and request their Lordships’ concurrence.” We gave a great cheer. We thought our majority satisfactory; that was not the common opinion, and it was true that our friends were rather slack in their attendance. For example, Lord Uxbridge and Captain Byng preferred staying at the Doncaster races to their Parliamentary duties.

FROM DIARY.

September 22.—I accompanied Russell with the Bill to the Lords. The House was crowded. The Lord Chancellor came to the Bar very solemnly; but, methought, looked a little arch when Russell

presented the Bill. Lord Grey came in, and a good many of us stayed to hear him fix the second reading for Monday week. 1831.

Sir Henry Hardinge had some conversation with me; and I told him of the strong resolutions passed at Lord Ebrington's, of supporting Government in very strong measures—prorogation of Parliament, creation of Peers, reintroduction of the Bill, and suspension of Standing Orders. He said that the result would be a fight. He felt sure the Lords would reject the Bill.

Lord Grey to-night made use of the words, "If the Bill is read, which I trust it will be." A very injudicious "if."

Hardinge comes to get what he can out of me. Of course I tell him no lies, nor no truths, except such as I think he ought to propagate. 'Tis an awful moment, that is certain.

September 24.—I attended the great dinner given to the Ministers at Stationers' Hall. There were 260 guests, and all the arrangements were as good as possible—so were most of the speeches. I remarked that the company was, to the full, as noisy and impatient as our Westminster tradesmen at the Crown and Anchor, although representing the greatest and proudest families in our Empire.

September 30.—At four o'clock I went to the House of Commons, and got through the Committee on my Vestry Bill with only one alteration in it.

1831. There are various rumours as to the number by which the Reform Bill will be rejected by the Lords; but all agree it will be lost.

October 3.—The great debate commenced to-day in the Lords. Lord Grey spoke three hours, in his best style, and appealed to the Bishops in a way which showed he despaired of their votes. Lord Wharncliffe moved the absolute rejection of the Bill, in terms which he withdrew afterwards, and substituted the usual form, deferring the Bill for six months. The House was quite full, and fitted up with galleries, as at the Queen's trial.

I heard the Duke of Wellington make one of the poorest speeches he ever made. He gave quite a different account of his resignation from that given by Sir R. Peel; said Reform had nothing to do with it, and begged their Lordships not to pledge themselves either way about Reform. He added, whatever had been his opinion as a man, yet as a Minister he had opposed Reform. In short, his Grace made a shabby, shuffling speech, very like a man wanting office again.

Lord Harrowby, though recommending moderation, was very bitter and personal. The general result was now pretty well known, but the numbers of the majority were guessed at very variously.

This night I read my Factory Bill a third time, and passed it. I also brought up the Report on my Vestry Bill at near two in the morning.

1831.

October 5.—I carried up my Factory Bill and several other Bills to the Lords. The Lord Chancellor seemed in a merry mood. I was obliged to go to the House of Commons, and it was half-past one before I could move the third reading of my Vestry Bill. Mr. Trevor proposed an adjournment, and was supported by George Dawson and my friend Sir Robert Inglis. We divided 38 against 8; and my opponents not knowing what to do next, I carried my Bill at last, for which thank Heaven! It is a very great reform indeed!

October 6.—I carried up my Vestry Bill, with other Bills, to the Lords. Lord Tenterden received them from me. On my bringing up the second Bill, he said to me, "I beg your pardon, sir, for not bowing to you before." I did not know what he meant; but perhaps he recollected that the last time he had spoken to me was when I was brought before him and the other Judges of the Court of King's Bench, to move for my release from Newgate, when he called me "the prisoner at the Bar."

October 7.—I called on Lord Ebrington about the projected meeting of House of Commons Reformers, the day after the rejection of the Bill. Lord Ebrington had seen the Lord Chancellor in the morning. He seemed somewhat fearful of popular tumult, and said he hoped that I would not use violent language in debate.

I told him there was no fear of my using violent

1831. language. Indeed, it was silly of Lord Ebrington to dread such a thing. We Parliamentarians are, for the most part, mealy-mouthed, and fall into the opposite extreme.

Ebrington said that the debate would finish to-night, because Government did not like it to end on a Saturday evening, when workmen were paid off. Here is a precaution indeed!! However, no one seemed to think the debate could end before Monday, so I resolved to visit my family at Brighton.

October 8. Saturday.—A dark, stormy day—"big with the fate," etc. About three o'clock I saw a newspaper, the *Advertiser*. *Bill lost by a majority of 41.*

	Against.	For.
Present . .	150	128
Proxies . .	49	30
	<hr/> 199	<hr/> 158

The Archbishop of Canterbury made a short speech against, and led off twenty Bishops with him. Only two Bishops for the Bill. The House adjourned at twenty minutes past six in the morning.

October 9.—The Tories give out Grey has resigned. Brougham's speech said by Lord Grey to be miraculous, and everybody talking of it in the same strain. I read it attentively, and, excepting the sarcasms and replies *ad hominem*, did not see anything so wonderful in the per-

formance. He ended by kneeling down on one knee, and drank a bottle of mulled port during the performance. 1831.

The *Chronicle* is in mourning. The *Times*, *Herald*, and other papers assuming an awful tone. The Common Council and Merchants and Bankers of London are to meet immediately, and of course the Westminster Reformers.

CHAPTER XII

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

1831. *October* 10.—I went to a Westminster meeting at the Crown and Anchor, the largest meeting I ever met in the great room there. Everything passed off with the greatest spirit and propriety; nothing could be better, except that I had my pocket picked as I was borne through the crowd, amidst great cheering, to the top of the room. As there was a call of the House, we shortened our proceedings, and I went down to answer my name there, and, although it was not twelve o'clock, could hardly find a place vacant.

When the debate came on, Lord Ebrington moved his resolution for standing by the Ministers and their Bill; but his tone was very moderate. Dundas, M.P. for Berkshire, seconded him in an equally moderate style: so it appeared to me, who was ready to speak and expected to do so, that it would be very difficult to take a properly spirited line. Macaulay made a speech, and took a totally different view of the question from Ebrington. He went somewhat near the wind on the intimidation side; and I told him so, and I saw he was not pleased. I took

that liberty as an older Member and an older man. 1831.

Our opponents were in low spirits. Goulburn, as usual, was of no use to them. Even Peel was humble; deprecating a division for fear of pledging Members to the rejected Bill, and referring to Tom Duncombe's recommendation of mutual concession! The moderation of T. D. showed that clever gentleman in a totally new character. We had a great majority—329 to 198.

This same day came news of disturbances at Derby, and of the burning of Nottingham Castle, the property of the Duke of Newcastle. One or two of the Bishops were insulted going to the House; and Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, complained of it in Parliament. I heard Lord Grey put down this same Bishop, in the House, for accusing him of inflaming the people against the Bishops. Lord Grey spoke to him in a tone of the most contemptuous severity, and, when he rose to interrupt, told him to be silent, as if he was speaking to a noisy child.

October 12.—I went to Court to present addresses from the electors assembled at the Crown and Anchor, the parishioners of St. Anne's, Westminster, and other large bodies of Metropolitan electors. I was surprised on going into the streets to find the shops shut, and a great many ill-looking and ill-dressed people standing about. There was something in the look and manners of the crowds which, I confess, I did not like.

1831. In Bond Street I saw a large placard with this inscription: "199 *versus* 22,000,000!" and I went into the house to persuade the shopman to take it down. He was a shoemaker, and, though very civil, was very firm, and refused to remove the placard, saying he had only done as others had done. When I told him who I was, he said, "Oh, I know you very well"; but he still declined to follow my advice.

There was a strong force of police and of Horse Guards near St. James's Palace. A line of the latter was drawn across Pall Mall to keep off a crowd, whose banners I saw beyond the soldiers, and whose shouts I heard. Processions paraded the Mall, which might have been seen by the King from the Palace windows. The parishioners from St. Pancras had, besides their banners, two red caps of liberty, and they huzzaed lustily; but I saw no violence of any kind, nor heard of any disaster.

As I had not been to Court since the death of my father, I was presented by Lord Lansdowne; at least, his name was on my card. I presented the petitions to His Majesty, and met with a most gracious reception. He spoke to me of my father, and said, "I fear he suffered much at the last." He then inquired after Lady H. and my sisters, and behaved to me with marked kindness and attention.

I went to the House of Commons through masses of people, who were noisy enough, but

1831.

not mischievous. I was much vexed, however, to hear that the Duke of Wellington's windows had been broken, and that Lord Londonderry had been wounded by a stone. These occurrences were too true, and disgraceful enough. At the House of Commons I heard Lord Althorp and Lord John Russell complained of as having inflamed the populace by the answers which they had given to the addresses from the Birmingham Union. A day or two before it was asserted that the rejection of the Bill had caused no excitement.

The next day the streets were quiet, and the crowds had disappeared. The disturbance now was transferred to the House of Commons, where Mr. Trevor brought forward his foolish motion about rate-paying; and Sir Charles Wetherell moved, as an amendment upon it, his more foolish proposal for a special Commission to inquire about the riots in the country. This personage so misbehaved himself that it was charitable to think him either drunk or crazy. He threw his legs on the bench, and called on Lord Althorp to speak up. We passed the word that no notice should be taken of his speech; but, as he had fallen foul of O'Connell, we could not prevent that gentleman from rising and giving Sir Charles his deserts. The castigation was most complete and most severe. He called Wetherell's speech "a rollicking rodomontade," and no epithet could be better applied to it. Even Sir H.

1831. Hardinge spoke of it as it deserved; but soon turned the conversation on the misconduct of Ministers, and their contributing to popular excitement. He told me that he carried about him a small pocket pistol, which he should use if attacked; and informed me that the Duke of Wellington's servants were armed, and had orders to shoot any one who attempted to enter the courtyard of Apsley House.

I took the chair this day at a meeting of parishioners of St. George's, Hanover Square, who were called together to test the truth of an assertion made by Lord Wharncliffe, in the Lords, that the shopkeepers in Bond Street and St. James's Street were opposed to Reform. The meeting assembled in Farm Street Mews. Lord Wharncliffe himself came, but did not address the meeting.

On going away Lord Wharncliffe told me that a man, dressed like a gentleman, shook a rope at him; and he informed me that he had received threatening letters respecting his Yorkshire mansion. I could not help remarking that, considering the prominent part he had taken against the Bill, I was not surprised at this news. He assured me he was not against all Reform, but only against the Bill. I afterwards heard he was not pleased with the anti-Reformers refusing to join him in some moderate scheme; and I thought he was not quite satisfied with the line he had taken. There was a great meeting in Yorkshire

the day before; and the bankers and merchants of London met on this day. The feeling in the country seemed to be intense. 1831.

I cannot refrain from recording here that Lady Jersey's windows overlooked Farm Street Mews; and I heard that fair anti-Reformer was looking out upon us revolutionists. This lady I had the honour of knowing well, not only at the time when she patronised the Whig party, but afterwards, when she adopted a totally different line; but she never discontinued her civilities to me. It may easily, therefore, be believed that, when I heard her mention that I had advised the mob to break her windows, I was compelled to give a flat denial to so strange an invention. I was not a little annoyed at this attack, in her own house, before some of her new friends; and I should have been glad to forget it, if possible. But I was not permitted to do so; for the great lady, most friendly in every other respect, lost no opportunity of repeating the scandal. Even if I had been capable of making so disgraceful a proposal, it was impossible the lady should have heard it from her windows; the distance would not admit of it. But it was neither more nor less than a pure fiction; and, as I said at the time, her Ladyship must have dreamt it.¹

¹ The Editor, years after, heard this fiction repeated at dinner, 42, Berkeley Square, by Lady Jersey, half in joke. "You know, Sir John, you told the mob to break my windows." Sir John, paraphrasing the remark about Waterloo to George IV., replied, "I have heard your Ladyship say so."

1831. FROM DIARY.

October 14.—The Lords have referred my Vestry Bill to a select committee. This I considered as tantamount to rejecting it. I spoke to G. Lamb, who thought so too, and expressed his conviction that without parochial reform the peace of the metropolis could not be preserved. The Duke of Wellington seems as eager against my Bill as against Lord J. Russell's.

I went to Downing Street with my three addresses. I put them into the hands of Lord Grey's secretary and son-in-law, Charles Wood (afterwards Lord Halifax), who told me that one of the Yorkshire addresses to Lord Grey had received a hundred thousand signatures.

October 20.—Lord Grey addressed a letter to me, which was published in the newspapers of October 17, in which he promised an equally efficient Reform Bill for the next session of Parliament. This, however, did not satisfy the impatient metropolitans, who drew up a memorial recommending a creation of Peers, and an adjournment of Parliament for seven days. Accordingly seventeen delegates waited on Lord Grey, and had an interview which was not very agreeable to either party. There is, it must be confessed, a good deal of officious interference and over-anxiety on the part of friends; at the same time I see no reason to be surprised at their restlessness, considering the state of the country and the opposition of the Peers.

1831.

It is generally believed that the Cabinet are divided upon the question, and I gather as much from a letter which I have received from Lord Durham, in which he complains of the hostility and lukewarmness of friends, and wishes he was supported by such men as myself.

Just at this time comes the defeat of Ponsonby in Dorsetshire, and the Tories are going to try their hands in Cambridgeshire. The City Tories also rejected the Lord Mayor Key, twice chosen by the Livery. All these efforts show that our opponents are resolved to fight to the last. I nevertheless believe that the majority of the Lords now regret their triumph. They foolishly thought that their vote would turn out the Ministers; but now, seeing that they stay in, their apprehension is that the whole Bill will be carried by a majority in the Peers, and no modification ever admitted, such as they might have got by admitting the second reading.

Sir Alexander Cray Grant¹ told me he knew this was the case, and that the anti-Reformers were fools for their pains. In the meantime the funds rise a little; this is attributed to the probable settlement of the Belgian question.

Parliament was prorogued this day, and the Royal Assent given to my Vestry Bill, which now applies to open as well as close vestries.

October 24.—I have read Fouché's Memoirs for

¹ Sir Alexander Grant, M.P. for Westbury, was Chairman of Committees.

1831. the first time. It seems incredible that any man should have been guilty of the superlative baseness of which he confesses himself guilty, or rather which he owns to and defends. He says he did send a detail of the plan of Napoleon's entrance into Belgium in 1815, by a Madame D., but took care to have obstacles thrown in her way, so that she did not arrive till after the battle. Nevertheless Fouché does not appear to have been a man of a bad heart. Madame de Staël hits off his character admirably in her "Ten Years of Exile."

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

November 4.—Sir F. Burdett unadvisedly took the chair at a meeting of the working-classes, constituted under the name of the "National Union." I knew some of the most active of these gentlemen, and that this was a scheme for watching and controlling Members of Parliament.

Burdett's excuse is that if he did not put himself at the head of this Union some designing man or men would. Whereas the truth is, and I told him so, that if he did not, it would fall to the ground altogether. My good colleague generally says Yes, to the last speaker, except in Parliament, where he always says No; at least, has done so for the greater part of his life. He is so pure himself that he cannot suspect any one of artifice or malice. But his facility embarrasses his coadjutors very much.

1831.

I do not know what took place at the meeting, except that Wakley (afterwards Coroner and M.P. for Finsbury) became completely master of the situation, and, amongst other proofs of his predominance, contrived to get a Council appointed of which one-half were to belong to the working-classes; and, when Burdett opposed this, Wakley called him to order!!! The consequence of this was, the Unionists and the Westminster Reformers came to a decided quarrel; and the latter resolved to establish a separate Association, confining their objects to supporting the Ministerial Reform Bill and preserving the peace of the City. The Unionists announced a great meeting of the working-classes at White Conduit House, with Wakley in the chair. The anti-Reformers were very vehement in their preference of the Union politicians, which, I thought, might be easily accounted for.

In the meantime, I was pleased to hear that Lord Melbourne, Home Secretary, was on the alert, and quite prepared for any attempts which might be made by the madmen of any party. He knew that either the overthrow of the monarchy or of the administration would be the inevitable result of the contemplated movement.

FROM DIARY.

November 5.—The Government have issued a proclamation in the King's name, respecting the Bristol and other riots, which Tory papers call

1831. the Reform riots, of course. It must be confessed that the Administration have a most difficult course to steer, between the people on the one hand, whom they are afraid to appeal to for fear of mischief, and the Tories, who cannot be conciliated, except at the expense of character, consistency, popular support, and finally their places. The true way, I think, would be to buy off some of the most active agitators, and then to take exactly what course they thought most expedient to carry their Reform, without caring for a paragraph in one or two newspapers, nor for a few placards or a Union proclamation. I suppose, of course, that they mean honestly themselves.

Lord Grey is evidently not blind to the consequences, and when waited upon by the seventeen delegates at midnight, said, "If I am driven from office it will be by these things," striking the memorial with his finger. This was not in the newspaper report. I had it from one who was present. It was not surprising that Lord Grey should say this, with seventeen men looking in on him at near midnight, some of whom were such ill-looking fellows that my friend De Vear told me he got before one of them that Lord Grey might not see him. And then these men modestly asked him to reassemble Parliament in seven days.

I have given my opinion pretty plainly as to the propriety of this proceeding, and displeased my Westminster friends thereby. The fact is,

most of the party went merely from over zeal and officiousness; some, I think, had projects of a very decisive nature. 1831.

Lord Grey received them very civilly, but he should not have received them at all, as any one will acknowledge who reads the use made of this interview in the *Quarterly Review*.¹

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

November 7.—I heard an anecdote at this time which illustrates in very lively colours the mischievous character of the anti-Reformers. Mr. Howard Elphinstone, afterwards M.P. for Hastings, told me that, being at the late Sussex county meeting, he heard George Dawson say to the Ministerialists, "You have brought a banner here with 'No Bishops' written upon it; and you do not dare to show it, so you have furled it." The High Sheriff interrupted him. "Mr. Dawson," said he, "I cannot permit this. The banner was furled out of courtesy to me; it is no question of daring." This was not in the newspaper report of the proceedings, and, doubtless, was left out purposely, in order that the reckless malice of these gentlemen might not be exposed. This would have made it manifest that they wanted

¹ The deputation from several of the London parishes headed by a Mr. Carpire, "a medical man," and Francis Place, attended on the Prime Minister at midnight, praying his Lordship to recommend the King not to prorogue Parliament for a longer period than seven days. A full report of the interview appeared in the *Courier* of October 3, and this is freely quoted in an article on the state of the Government in the *Quarterly Review*, Vol. XLVI.

1831. to create a commotion, and then to complain of it.

The news of the breaking out of the cholera at Sunderland, about this time, alarmed some people as much as the Reform Bill and dread of revolution frightened others; and with much more reason. As for the latter panic, there was not the slightest excuse, and Sir Francis Burdett, coming into contact with these Unionists, found them, so he told me, perfectly insignificant.

FROM DIARY.

November 9.—Saw Joe Hume and his good little wife. He is a singular fellow indeed, and persuades many people he understands all the subjects he talks about. He is to be made Lord Rector of Glasgow University this year, for the second time, I believe, and a paragraph in the *Herald* tells how great a linguist Joe is, and how much Greek and Latin, all Oriental, and most modern tongues he knows. “Le pauvre Gil Perez, à peine en savait-il les premiers principes.” If he knows Greek and Latin it is without learning them.

November 10.—Burdett has dined twice with Lord Grey lately, and says truly of him that nothing is such a mistake as calling him a haughty, unbending man—quite the contrary, he is too pliant, too easily swayed; and does not seem sensible that he is the sole responsible Minister, and if Reform fails, to him will the

failure be imputed. No one knows anything except of "Lord Grey," either at home or abroad; if therefore there are those in the Cabinet who disagree with Lord Grey, he must turn them out. 1831.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

November 11.—Burdett took the chair at the so-called National Union, and consented to the Council being composed mainly of artisans. But these Unionists were not safe associates, and Sir Francis Burdett told me that he had been announced as chairman of a public meeting of St. James's parish without his consent. I said, as Garrick did to Johnson, "I shall have to bail my old friend out of the round-house." He said, "I tell you what—the more I see, the more I am convinced that there is no having to do with any but gentlemen; that is, with men of education." A short time after this Sir F. Burdett withdrew from the National Political Union.

FROM DIARY.

November 12.—Edward Ellice complained to me of Stanley's going back to Ireland. Stanley had said to him that the Irish hated him as much as he hated the Irish. Here is a pretty fellow to govern a country! Ellice said Lord Grey was all right; but—but—but he added that there had been certain signs of conversion amongst the Peers. He deprecated delay in Parliament meeting; Lord Durham called it worse than drivelling, and

1831. Lord Duncannon was of the same opinion. Then whence the delay? As Burdett said to me, Lord Grey should turn the dissentients out of his Cabinet.

November 17.—Writing to De Vear to-day, I said, “If by some error in judgment”—for I am unwilling to believe it can originate from any other cause—“Parliament should not meet soon, then all Reformers, and we above all, must be on the alert.” I foresee a squabble amongst our Westminster friends, which, if Reform does not take place, will probably break them up and cost me my seat. About this I am more than indifferent, for I think I should like an honest excuse for quitting public life—at least as M.P. for Westminster. I know I have done my duty, and if others do not think so, I cannot help it.

November 18.—Finished Madame de Staël’s De-launay Memoirs, a very amusing and very instructive book. It is wonderful that whilst there are such books in the world any one can gravely recommend the old French régime, in preference to the modern manners and political condition of that country. The account of the Castelmare conspiracy shows how politics and intrigue were mixed in the old courts of Europe. Europe might have been drenched in blood for the sake of the Duchess of Maine’s precedence.

November 24.—The Westminster Reform Association dissolved itself yesterday at the appearance of the proclamation, under pretext of their rules

bringing them within the law ; but, in fact, because the *attempt was failing*. The householders would not associate, “*ibi omnis effusus labor,*” but I am glad. 1831.

December 5.—Burdett told me our Reform prospects were not favourable—no converts. The King, against so far as inclination went, but being an honourable man, would not give in. He said that the National Union was going fast to pieces ; and so much the better, added he. I had previously heard from him that the Union had hesitated about accepting his resignation, and I saw the correspondence. They are trying to trick him, he pretending not to see their manœuvre. Such is the consequence of one false step even in the best of men.

FROM BOOK, “RECOLLECTIONS.”

December 6.—Parliament met. The House of Commons was empty when compared with its numbers during the fierce contests of the recent session.

Several occurrences, and particularly the Bristol riots, had tended to cool the ardour of most politicians ; and it required all the sagacity and courage of the tried friends of Parliamentary Reform to persevere in the course most likely to obtain their object without risk to public tranquillity.

The Royal Speech was a good speech, inasmuch as it afforded very little for opponents to lay hold

1831. of. It opened with Reform, and allowed the right of popular meetings to discuss political questions ; but denied that this right extended to the organisation of political unions. Peel promised to discuss the new Reform Bill dispassionately. Russell gave notice that he should bring forward that Bill on the following Monday. This drew a loud cheer from our benches.

FROM DIARY.

December 7.—I saw Tavistock to-day. He told me the King says he considers it to be the duty of a constitutional King to stand by his Ministers ; but Tavistock added he believed H.M. was not for Reform.

No amendment in the Lords, and Lord Harrowby made a sort of conceding speech. Nevertheless I believe the Lords are preparing a surprise, as before, and mean to throw out the Bill.

At the House of Commons Lord Althorp presented the Yorkshire address signed by 140,000 ; but this did not prevent Mr. Croker from being somewhat smart and insolent, nor Hunt from being lying and vulgar.

December 12.—I went to the House of Commons, and heard Lord John Russell propose his new Reform Bill. I thought the Bill an improvement on the former Bill, and I believe that was the general opinion. But Peel made a most unjust and ungenerous attack on the Government, congratulating the House on the *escape* which his

party and the Lords had procured for the country from the old Bill. 1831.

I hardly ever felt so angry in my life, and had half a mind to speak; but Althorp made a very good and spirited reply, and subsequently Lord Clive spoke in a conciliatory tone, as did Lord Chandos, and Baring, all of whom owned the Bill to be an improvement. Croker was insolent as usual. Peel apparently made a bad hit, and forgot he was leader of a party, for when he was taunted with Lord Clive's moderation, he rose to say he should act for himself. Portman of Dorsetshire made an indiscreet effort to *nail* Clive to his new position, which made Clive explain. Nugent called this "heading the fox."

December 16.—The second reading of the new Reform Bill came on. Lord Porchester moved to delay it to "this day six months." Lord Mahon made a good speech; but, alluding to Macaulay, who had just sauntered into the House, drew up that extraordinary young man, who made one of his best speeches—indeed, one of the best I ever heard—and took occasion to tell Peel some very home truths about himself and his Administration. We cheered and huzzaed. Peel looked as if sweating blood. I never saw him so scalded, not even in the days of Brougham. Croker followed Macaulay. Reply to him he did not, nor could not. His speech was a tirade against Ministers and revolutionary politics in general, with illustrations from English and French history, full

1831. of the grossest mistakes, which Macaulay detected at once, and I handed down corrections of them to Lord Althorp. Lord Althorp said to me, "Will you undertake him?" I, seeing he wished to speak, answered "No." Althorp spoke ill, and several Members told me that I ought to have answered Croker. Indeed, I thought I should have done it well, for he had laid himself very open.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

December 17.—This evening was conspicuous, in our Reform debates, for a great speech from [Lord] Edward Stanley, who lashed Mr. Croker so soundly as he had never been lashed before. He exposed his false history about Charles I. and his Parliaments, and told him "Inaccurate reading was as dangerous as a little reading," alluding to Macaulay's exposure of Croker's "*Boswell's Life of Johnson*," in the *Edinburgh Review*, in which the quotation had been applied to Croker's edition of that famous book. But what pleased me most was the genuine English spirit which breathed through all he said. He was tremendously cheered when he sat down.

Then Peel rose, and for three-quarters of an hour made a very lame and laboured defence of himself against Macaulay's speech of the night before. He talked of the "sweltered venom" of his antagonist, but confessed admiration for his talents. He read his correspondence with the Duke of Wellington respecting his wish to retire

from office in 1829. But he did not and could 1831.
not answer Macaulay's charges of unhandsome conduct in taunting Ministers with adopting the suggestions of their opponents; "coming," as Macaulay said, "from a man whose administration would be known only by its concessions." Peel concluded by declaring positively he would never be a party to any measure of Parliamentary Reform. We had a majority of 324 to 162.

We went home in great glee, and Macaulay, walking with me, could not refrain from a little pleasantry at the expense of Peel's performances at Oxford. He rendered the "*suave mari magno*" of Lucretius in this way: "*suave*—it is a source of melancholy satisfaction." ¹

December 20.—I went down to Hastings, and found my wife decidedly better. During this visit I formed an acquaintance with a very agreeable man—Admiral Sir William Hotham ²—who had lived much in the world, and was a most acceptable guest at every table. Thomas Campbell, the poet, was at Hastings at this time, and, knowing him well, I brought him and Sir William a good deal together.

FROM DIARY.

December 22.—Sir W. Hotham and Thomas Campbell dined with us; also my friend Miss

¹ The authorised version, in Sir R. Peel's Life by the Right Honourable C. S. Parker, is "it is a source of satisfaction," without the word "melancholy."

² Born 1772; served under Nelson at Bastia, 1794; commanded *Adamant* at Camperdown, 1797; died 1848.

1831. Bayley, a very remarkable lady of great acquirements and a vigorous intellect.

Sir William told us that he was present at a dinner of naval officers in the West Indies when the Duke of Clarence was one of the company. H.R.H. rallied Captain Newcome, and dwelt rather more than was agreeable to him on his father being a schoolmaster at Hackney. The Captain, when the Duke asked him why his father had not bred him up to his own profession, replied, "Why, sir, I was such a stupid, good-for-nothing fellow, that my father could make nothing of me, so he sent me to sea."

The Admiral also told us that the King saw William Pitt and Lord Nelson for the last time, on the same day, within ten minutes of each other; and that both seemed impressed with the notion they were soon to die, particularly Nelson. Pitt told him he should never go to another Council. Hotham saw Pitt after this, at Bath, in high spirits, but knowing it was over with him. One day, at dinner, a foolish man would read a very long letter from a boy who was in the action at Trafalgar, which Pitt bore good-naturedly, though all were tired of never-ending stories about that battle. General Tarleton, who was present, took the letter and said he would read it, being best acquainted with sea terms. Pitt asked him what the "line of bearing" was. "Why," said Tarleton, "it is—it is—it is— . . . the—the—*line of bearing*."

Campbell was less absurd than usual, but he read us a dull prophecy concerning the future power of Russia—in verse. He told us that he once heard Sheridan, when drunk, address Lady Holland “My dear fellow!” 1831.

On another occasion, Sir William told me that when his ancestors, the two Hothams, were condemned by the Parliament¹ to lose their heads on the Tower Hill, the son was executed first, in order that two Baronets might not be put to death on the same day—a singular delicacy from Republicans. The estate was given back to the family after the Restoration; and the holder of it, being in Parliament, voted for the Exclusion Bill. The Duke of York remonstrated with him, and reminded him that two of his family had lost their heads, on which Hotham replied that he always bore that circumstance in mind, and it would be as well if H.R.H. would recollect that his father had perished for opposing the inclinations of his subjects. This anecdote is mentioned in the papers preserved by the Hotham family.

One more anecdote from the Admiral:

Lord Huntingdon, the late Sir C. Hotham, and a third person were dining at the inn at

¹ Sir John Hotham, the first Baronet, was Governor of Hull, and on the eve of hostilities refused to admit the King and his retinue; but in 1643 he and his son were accused of plotting to hand over the city to the Duke of Newcastle on behalf of the King, on which they were arrested and sent to London, where they were both beheaded by order of Parliament in 1645.

1831. Salt Hill; and talking of the American war then raging, Lord Huntingdon said that Lord North ought to lose his head, although he believed a good deal of the mischief was to be traced to the King's obstinacy. Shortly afterwards Hotham was at Windsor, and George III. addressed him thus: "You dined at Salt Hill the other day, and so and so were with you. Pray tell Lord Huntingdon from me that I respect his opinions, supposing that he holds them conscientiously; but that, when he devotes a Minister to the scaffold and accuses his King of obstinacy, I advise him first to turn the waiters out of the room."

December 29.—The Cholera is raging dreadfully and suddenly at Gateshead, where in 46 hours there have been about 103 cases and 52 deaths, the rate of mortality being as large as on the Continent, or larger. It is said to have been caused by the drunkenness of Christmas Day. Only one person at all above the lowest orders affected.

December 30.—I have read poor Walter Scott's last romances, "Robert of Paris" and "Castle Dangerous"; incredibly inferior to almost all his other performances, and smelling of apoplexy. Nevertheless, no one else perhaps could produce so good and lively an historical fiction as either of these tales.

1832. *January 1.*—I am glad the last melancholy year is over, although the present commences with no very favourable auspices.

January 22.—I left Hastings, and came up to London in the coach. T. P. Cooke, the actor, and his wife were of the party. He is a very pleasing-mannered, good-looking man, with a good deal of unassuming conversation. He has been a common sailor, and then went on the stage to perform the part of the strong man at Sadler's Wells; afterwards he tried higher departments, and I hear that his William in *Black-eyed Susan* is a very pathetic performance. He talked to me of Talma, with whom he seems to have been well acquainted, and of Kean, whom he knows intimately. He is rather an extraordinary man if his origin be taken into consideration. 1832.

I find that few people, if any, approve of the Reform measure altogether, the general impression with all those who have anything to lose being that it goes too far.

I took up my residence at 42, Berkeley Square. Lady Hobhouse and her family left England for the Continent, and I rented the house of her during her lifetime.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

January 24.—At House of Commons. The schedules of the Reform Bill came on. I voted with Ministers for dividing Lincolnshire into two counties. We had 193 to 64, and the Tories were so angry that they walked out of the House in a body.

1832. The next day, January 25, I heard from Lord Howick that all arrangements were made for carrying the Reform Bill. I remarked thereon, "Of course, if your father has thrown the country into this ferment, without the certainty of carrying his measure, he deserves to be hanged." He smiled, and said he agreed with me; "but the thing was done." Several other official people held the same language to me; but all regretted that the creation of a sufficient number of Peers had been delayed.

I became in those days acquainted with a man who figured as a leader of a powerful party—I mean Lord George Bentinck. He did not support Ministers, but as yet he did not oppose them. His chief dislike was to Sir Robert Peel. He gave me a lamentable account of the Nottingham riots, and assured me that the convicts had not the slightest notion that they would be proceeded against capitally. On the contrary, they expressed their surprise that the Attorney-General did not come to defend them. Indeed, the language held by some of our adherents was sufficient to mislead better-informed men than the rioters. My friend Colonel Wildman, purchaser of Newstead Abbey, addressing a meeting which might fairly be called a mob, told them that they were "God Almighty's aristocracy." This was the aristocracy that burnt Nottingham Castle, and, when some of them were condemned to suffer for it, a petition was

circulated to save them, which it was not very easy to refuse to sign, and similar efforts were made to save the Bristol rioters; but, if our criminal code awards death as a punishment for any crime, I could not see how these men could be saved.

January 26.—Mr. Perceval made his foolish motion for a general Fast, and the Government as foolishly gave way to his proposal.

Then followed a discussion on a subject which, at the time, created a great sensation, and led to consequences seriously affecting more than one public man—I allude to the Russian-Dutch loan. Mr. Herries moved three resolutions on this subject, the last of them condemnatory of the Ministers for continuing the payment of the loan after the separation of Belgium from Holland, without applying to Parliament. Lord Althorp moved the previous question on the two first resolutions, and a decided negative on the last.

We had very melancholy forebodings as to the result of the vote, but in the midst of the discussion news came that Ministers had a majority of 37 on the Belgian question in the Lords. A still more useful effect was produced by Sir Robert Peel, who, though he made a strong anti-Ministerial speech, let out that, even if the vote of censure passed, he should not think himself precluded from paying the money. This gave an excuse to the economical Members

1832. to vote for Ministers; and Lord Palmerston then made a speech which I thought far the best he had ever made since he joined the Whig Cabinet. We had a majority of 239 to 219. On the vote of censure our majority was larger, for we were 238 to 214. I had the satisfaction of hearing afterwards that Sir John Leech had said Ministers had interpreted the treaty rightly, and Dr. Jenner said the same; yet Lord Palmerston was the only Minister who took the right line in the debate. I should, however, have supported Ministers even if they had made a mistake about the loan, for, if Ministers were displaced, I knew we should not have Reform of Parliament—the sole object of my public life.

FROM DIARY.

January 26.—This day I had a long talk with Frank Place, who told me that when the Lords threw out the last Bill there was so little real feeling or spirit in the people that it required all the efforts of a few individuals to found the National Political Union, and that the Birmingham Union was just kept alive by the subscription of three men who sent £50 apiece and saved it. He said that even now the National Political Union was mere moonshine, and the Birmingham the same. He added that a vigorous Tory Ministry would keep the people down easily for some time, but that they would rise at last and *walk over all the upper classes.*

I had no notion of the apathy or disgust of the people, but he assured me he was right. 1832.

January 28.—Sir James Macdonald had a long talk with me, and told me Ministers could not stand with the present Treasury Bench, and that I must come into office, also Macaulay. I said nothing, except that Ministers did appear to want assistance.

January 30.—King Charles's Martyrdom was a holiday at the House of Commons. Going to Brooks's, I heard that Sir Henry Parnell had been dismissed from the War Office for not voting with Ministers on the Russian-Dutch loan.

January 31.—I had a note from Lord Althorp, desiring me to call on him at eleven o'clock. On my walking to Downing Street I was overtaken by a man with a note from Lord Durham, begging me to call on him at twelve. I went to Lord Althorp; so soon as the door was shut and we were alone he said, "Sit down; we want you in harness." "As how?" said I. "As Secretary-at-War," replied he. The substance of my answer was, "That there were two points for consideration on that proposal: first, my own feelings as to the propriety of accepting the office; and, secondly, how the electors of Westminster would feel on the subject: therefore I should require some little time for consideration." Lord Althorp assented, and then added, he would tell me as a friend what was not to be communicated to others, "that Ministers would carry the Reform

1832. 'Bill, but were not likely to be permanent.' I said that "the carrying the Bill was the only important matter with me; the instability of Ministers would not affect my answer."

He told me that perhaps it might be agreeable to me to know that the Cabinet were unanimous in wishing me to take office. He added that their decision had been conveyed to the King yesterday, and that His Majesty had returned an answer highly complimentary to me and approving of the offer.

I told Lord Althorp that the Secretaryship of War was the least agreeable place he could offer to me. He owned it, but said it was a high place, and they had no other to give me. Nor were we likely to differ except on one point, namely, flogging. I told him that on that point I might come to some terms, but that I was not sure of my capacity for the details of the office. This he overruled; and he added that my assent would be of advantage to the Ministers and to the cause of Reform.

Lord Durham told me much the same as Lord Althorp had told me, but entered more into detail as to the wishes of the Cabinet Ministers, particularly the Tory portion of them, and Lord Palmerston *nominatim*. He assured me that the office would be only a step to a more important position, and that no one would be promoted over my head. I told him that, although of course I did not forget what was

1832.

due to my position, my chief reflection was as to the good to be done to the public; and I had doubts as to my capacity for the office. He replied that "my appointment would do away with any bad impression that might be made by the dismissal of Sir Henry Parnell; and that, as for capacity, there could be no doubt." He told me that the Reform measure was to be carried without doubt. On this I remarked that, without that preliminary assurance, I could not think of taking office.

My next application was to Mr. De Vear, my good Westminster chairman. He strongly recommended my acceptance of the office, and after deliberation I was resolved to give an answer in the affirmative. I was quite aware of the objections to such a course, and I think I may say that I was as little swayed by private and selfish considerations as any man could be under similar circumstances. The Administration had just received a severe check. Parnell's retirement might injure them still further. Lord Althorp's hint was anything but encouraging. I had little to gain. I had the certainty of losing leisure and tranquillity, and the chance of sacrificing reputation by discovering my incapacity for office. I had nothing to encourage me but the consciousness of coming forward, when most wanted, to assist in carrying through the great measure which it had been the object of my whole public life to obtain.

1832. As to personal distinction, it was hardly sufficient to have much weight, if any; for many might think the place too low for me, whilst it might subsequently be found to be too high. To this might be added the peculiar nature and duty of the office in Parliament, particularly obnoxious to an old antagonist of barracks and standing armies. However, I made up my mind; went to Brooks's, and, finding the rumour afloat, scarcely denied it. I wrote a short note to Lord Durham, conveying my assent; then went to Lord Althorp. He took me in his carriage to the House of Commons. I said, "Well, I say yes." "That's right," said he; and so the affair ended with this good creature of few words.

The business was soon buzzed about the House. A good many men congratulated me, and a great many compliments, not worth recording, were addressed to me. The Speaker shook hands with me as I passed the Chair. Sir Henry Hardinge said that there would be a good many extra bottles drunk at the United Service Club; and that I should do justice between the soldiers and the public. My friend Lord Maitland alone seemed a little sour. He said, "Of course you would not take it, if you did not think the Government likely to last."

I sat up until twelve in the House; and thus ended this, to me, important day—the opening of a new scene in my life.

February 1.—I called on Lord Grey in Downing

Street. He was very kind and complimentary. 1832.
He read to me that part of the King's letter which referred to me. It approved of the dismissal of Sir H. Parnell; said of me that it had not escaped His Majesty's notice that I had discountenanced the Unions; that I was of an old family (umph!) and high station; of literary habits, likely to be qualified for business, and such a person as would be agreeable for personal intercourse with him; adding, of undoubted abilities, and concluding, "His Majesty hopes Sir John Hobhouse will not refuse the offer."

Lord Grey then gave me some hints as to the nature and duty of my office; criticised Parnell's conduct in some respects; begged me to keep up a good understanding with the Commander-in-Chief and Lord Fitzroy Somerset, and to speak to them, rather than write, when any differences occurred.

I thought Lord Grey looked ill, and when I asked him how he was he shook his head.

February 2.—Mr. De Vear called with a resolution, passed at a meeting of Westminster electors, approving of my conduct, and asking me to stand again for the city.

I saw Lord Althorp, who seemed in good spirits. This is a bad sign, for nothing would please him so much as quitting office.

February 3.—I went down to Hastings, and passed a delightful day on the Saturday with my wife and her babies.

1832. *February 5.*—I returned to London this day, and dined with Lord Durham. I had some private talk with him after dinner, and he used some language which made me think that all was not right as to the Bill. I told him I had a character to lose, and if I had been deceived as to the resolution of carrying the Bill, I had also deceived my constituents and the public; and if the Bill were not carried I should be ruined, to say nothing of the country. He assented, and assured me he would give me warning in time. I added that I would quit office the moment I knew there was any hesitation. Lord Durham said he would too.

I was, however, determined not to take any hasty step, and I received assurances from more than one member of the Cabinet that, if the Reform Bill was not carried, the Government would break up.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

February 6.—I went to St. James's with Lord Durham. I was congratulated, and received in a most friendly manner, by all the Cabinet Ministers present, and had several civil speeches addressed to me. Lord Brougham said, "I do not congratulate you; I thank you." Sir James Graham paid me a still more elaborate compliment. My frequent meetings with "brother Brougham" at the S.S.B.S. had given rise to much intimacy between us. He and Lord Grey

1832.

were standing at the fire together, when he took out a bottle of medicine from the Lord Chancellor's purse, and drank it off, winking to us, and saying, "The Bill." I said, "I am glad you can swallow it." I had heard there had been some difficulty with him in the Cabinet; but Lord Grey told me that his speech on the Russian-Dutch loan the other night was one of the finest he had ever made. I heard that the Duke of Wellington spoke of it in the same terms. It had, indeed, settled the question, and recalled some of our deserters to their duty.

I kissed hands with the King on my appointment. His Majesty was very, very kind—talked of my father's last illness, of his intimacy with him, and of his mode of life. The King's last words to me on this occasion were, "I trust that your manners will be as pleasing in intercourse with me on public matters, as your father was in private life." He then said, "Goodbye, for the present"; and Lord Grey and myself walked away. Lord Grey said to me, "He gave you a most gracious reception," as indeed it was; but we had to wait a weary time in the Throne-room, whilst H.M. gave audience to several people. It was half-past four before the door opened, and the Privy Councillors took their seats at the table, at the head of which sat the King.

Mr. Tennyson, who had resigned the Clerkship of the Ordnance and was to be made a Privy

1832. Councillor, was ushered in with me by Mr. Bathurst, one of the Clerks of the Council, and we both of us knelt on cushions near His Majesty. We then took the accustomed oaths, and, when we had kissed the King's hand and risen, His Majesty said, "Gentlemen, take your places." We walked round the table, the Privy Councillors rising as we passed, and standing with their backs to the table: each of them shook hands with me. .

Lord Lansdowne read the programme. First there came the proclamation for the Fast. The King asked who preached. The Archbishop said he did not know. Lord Grey said, "A Bishop, of course." We all smiled. Indeed, during the whole proceeding, which consisted of reading Orders in Council and the King saying "Approved," we were whispering and talking, and making signs across the table, particularly Stanley, and Graham, and Grant. Having never seen the like before, I could not help saying to my neighbour, "Do you recollect Chancellor Oxenstiern's speech to his son?" It was a tiresome ceremony, as I thought then; and, having assisted at a good many of such afterwards, I may add that I think so still.

February 8.—This day was fixed upon for the Westminster electors to show whether or not they approved of the step I had taken. There was a very respectable crowd at Covent Garden, but not the least excitement of any kind. When I was

1832.

declared by the High Bailiff duly elected, there was a good deal of cheering, as also during my speech. I did not speak long, but told them "I should support the Ministers so long as they supported Reform; and support them as I had supported the popular cause—namely, *not by halves*, but without cavilling at little faults, decidedly and unremittingly." I told them "that the Ministers looked to the public for support, and, if they withheld it, Reform might yet be lost." In conclusion, I said "that my peaceable re-election was a practical refutation of one of the charges made against the Bill, namely, that a Member, accepting office, would not know where to find a seat, as he could not have recourse to a rotten borough."

There was not the slightest attempt at interruption. "The event certainly is favourable to the Government—at least it ought to be—so far as the election is concerned, although I have my misgivings as to my being any great accession to them as active debater and man of business in Parliament. Too much is expected of me, that is certain."

Such was my comment at the time, and I am afraid it was justified by my subsequent official conduct and character.

February 9.—I still heard doubts on the great question of creation of Peers. Lord Brougham was said to be wavering, and he frightened Lord Grey, who, I was assured, would be glad to be

1832. out of the concern. Lord Grey said, "D——n Reform! I wish I had never touched it." "A fine fellow," said —, "whom we are trying to make a great man of against his will!"—*bon gré, mal gré*—a wretched pun.

February 10.—I worked hard at the War Office, and then took my seat on the Treasury bench in the House of Commons. The Speaker (Sutton) called me to him, and addressed me thus: "I have three things to say to you—first, I am glad to see you again; secondly, I wish you joy of having to bring in the Army Estimates; thirdly, I hope you like being in the mire with the rest of them."

February 11.—Going down to Westminster I met Lord Howick, who said he wanted to speak with me; and, accordingly, we walked together for some time. He told me that he had had a conversation with his father the night before, and that Lord Grey still hesitated about creating Peers previously to the second reading. Lord Howick said that his father was not aware of the consequences of rejecting the Bill; and that, in fact, he was not aware even of the paramount importance of the measure itself, and confessed that, had he known what would ensue, would never have embarked in it. Lord Grey added that, up to a certain time, he and all the Cabinet were resolved upon the creation of Peers; but that Brougham fell ill, and then took fright, which was communicated to Lord Grey. Now

1832.

Lord Brougham had recovered from his panic, and Lord Grey had his doubts. He was most decidedly adverse to swamping the peerage, and desired to retire from office. He did not seem aware that he could not do that without losing his character, and risking the ruin of the country.

Lord Howick concluded by begging me to call on his father and state my opinion. I said I would do so, but should prefer a meeting of Members of Parliament to advise Lord Grey. Lord Howick remarked that his father would not like that; he would call it dictation, and would prefer friendly advice given privately.

And this is the man to whom the destinies of this great nation are entrusted! a man who, it now seems, took up Reform as a toy which he might break or lay down again; who knows nothing of its nature or consequences; who looks upon it as a mere trick of state for the preservation of power, and when he finds it disagreeable or not worth his while to retain that power, supposes he may abandon the cause with the same indifference as his house in Downing Street. This is incredible, but it is true!

I went to Burdett, and he was equally shocked with me. He agreed that I ought to save myself and resign office instantly, upon discovering that there was any intention of risking the Bill by not doing that which the Administration have the power of doing. This would dissolve the

1832. Ministry perhaps, but the fault would not be mine. The sacrifice of me is needless; it will not save them, nor ought they to be saved.

This day I dined at the Speaker's—my first Ministerial dinner. I had a serious conversation with Charles Grant on the state of affairs, and urged the necessity of creating Peers at once. I said I should go to Lord Grey before the Council the next day, and would resign office if I was not assured that the Bill was to be carried. I spoke to him, as one of the Cabinet, with the utmost freedom and unreserve, because I thought it was best to do so. I was aware that I was pledging myself to a step which might produce to myself very painful consequences. However, I have no doubt what I ought to do. It is absolutely necessary to take a decisive step. Nothing else will save the country from convulsion. The making of Peers, were it ever so objectionable, is nothing in comparison with the consequences of rejecting the Bill, and bringing back the old set and the old system.

February 12.—I called on Lord Durham. He told me that on the previous Thursday he had, through Lady Durham and Lady Grey, conveyed to Lord Grey his intention of resigning, unless the Bill was made quite safe in the House of Lords. He assured me that, when he persuaded me to accept office, everything was decided upon. As many Peers as were thought requisite were to be made, either at once, or by degrees; and on this the

whole Cabinet seemed determined, but Brougham's illness made him flinch, and his flinching raised doubts in Lord Grey; and both together revived the hesitation in that portion of the Cabinet that had originally objected to the creation of Peers. Amongst them were the Duke of Richmond, Melbourne, Palmerston, and even John Russell. 1832.

At this juncture two well-meaning Peers, Lord Harrowby and Lord Wharncliffe, had an interview with Sir Herbert Taylor, and proposed, under certain conditions, to vote for the second reading of the Bill. The main object of these personages was to prevent a large creation of Peers. The King considered the arrangement satisfactory, but Lord Grey wrote to Lord Durham saying he considered this proposal as anything but satisfactory.

This did not tally with what I heard from Lord Howick, and I mentioned that conversation to Lord Durham. He answered that the difference between the two statements was startling enough; but that Lord Grey was the most changeable man in the universe, and, without a steady monitor constantly at his elbow, would never persevere in anything.

He then entered into many details which subsequent events make it unnecessary to record, except to say that the Cabinet were not kept together except with the greatest difficulty, and Lord Durham had been obliged occasionally to bully both Lord Grey and the Cabinet. He said

1832. it was framed as if a mere "hors d'œuvre." Walking down the steps of the House of Lords, Lord Grey said to him, "Lambton, I wish you would take our Reform Bill in hand." Durham consented, but took Lord J. Russell, Sir James Graham, and Duncannon as coadjutors. Lord Durham told Russell that, being an author, he should draw it up; but Russell refused, and Lord Durham drew up the Bill himself. He made a sketch of the essential principles, and submitted it to the Cabinet at large. The Cabinet voted on this syllabus of the Bill, scarcely knowing what they did. It was sent to the King, who gave his consent in the same way. This sketch was afterwards given to Lord Holland, who talked of using it for his contemplated "History of His Own Times." He said Ballot was part of their original plan, but was not agreed to.

I then went to Lord Althorp, and told him I must have some positive assurance in regard to carrying the Reform Bill. Lord Althorp said, "I can set your mind at ease. Brougham and I will go out also, unless we have a moral certainty of carrying the measure." He seemed much pleased with this chance of quitting office. I told him that, "He never could go out as he came in, for that, if it was generally suspected he might have carried the measure, and would not do it, he would be stoned in the streets; and, if the other party came in, I saw no small

chance of his coming to the scaffold!" He smiled, and said, "I think so too; I have long thought so." He then told me they wished to avoid making Peers if possible. I replied that it was not possible. The proposal of Wharnccliffe and Harrowby was a trick. He granted that that might be, and added that, unless they had a security amounting to a moral certainty the Peers would do as they promised, either new Peers would be made or they would go out.

Lord Althorp said positively that Lord Grey would carry the Bill, but the mode of doing it must be left to him. I said: "Yes, if his mode was such as any man of sense and honour would declare was feasible; but a pretence would not do. It was as much as his life was worth to pretend he had security for the fulfilment of engagements, which his own conscience must tell him he had not. As for myself, I must have an engagement which could not be violated." Lord Althorp promised he would tell Lord Grey what I had said.

I went to Lord Grey's house, and saw Charles Wood. From him I learnt that on Friday night Lord Grey had told Howick nothing should make him consent to a creation of Peers; and on Saturday morning he had desired Wood to make out as large a list of new Peers as he could think of. Here's a man for you!!!

The same day I dined with Lord Althorp, and sat up with him alone until past twelve o'clock.

1832. He told me that he had seen Lord Grey and given my message. Lord Grey said, "He will not be worse off than we are; if we cannot carry the Bill we will go out."

I told Lord Althorp I did not agree with Lord Grey: he had made the Bill and originated many other measures, and had got into difficulties of his own; and I had joined him with assurance that Reform was to be carried, at great personal sacrifice, and in the hour of his utmost need, so that if he went out now merely because he would not make an effort to do what I was promised he could do, I should be a dupe, and should be thought to have deceived my constituents.

Lord Althorp made some sort of reply to this, half owning it was true, but he added that the Administration were not going out; that, "unless the King broke faith with them," they were sure of carrying their Bill in all its material enactments. Peers would be made, if necessary; the King had solemnly promised it.

Althorp talked very confidentially of his own repugnance to office, and said it destroyed all his happiness, adding that he "*removed his pistols from his bedroom for fear of shooting himself.*" Such are the secrets of the human heart! Who would have imagined that such a notion ever entered into the head of the pure, the imperturbable, the virtuous Althorp?

Amongst his confessions he said he was more attached to the Radicals than to any other party.



LORD ALTHORP.

John Charles, Third Earl Spencer (Viscount Althorp). By Sir G. Hayter.
By kind permission of his nephew, Viscount Althorp, to Lady Dorchester.

I believe it to be so. After all I have heard, however, I do not feel quite easy about the great measure, which the very indifference of Althorp to office puts into peril. I took leave of this excellent man with greater admiration of him than ever. 1832.

FROM DIARY.

February 13.—Lord Durham called, and gave me a satisfactory account of a correspondence now going on between the King and Lord Grey. One expression of His Majesty's was, how can it be ascertained that the creation of *forty or fifty Peers* will be sufficient? "Which," said Lord Durham, "is a good sign, inasmuch as it shows that the King thinks of forty or fifty being made." The King's last letter to Lord Grey was of several sheets, and Lord Grey's answer twice as long. What a singular correspondence for history!

February 14.—The Opposition have endeavoured to make the most of the few cases of Cholera, which at last has certainly come to London. Croker sounded the alarm last night.

February 15.—Dine with the Garrick Club, a new society to bring together friends of the drama. The Duke of Sussex in the chair, and all the principal actors present: a droll scene, but nothing will make the actors gentlemen nor the gentlemen actors.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

February 17.—This was to me a very important

1832. day. I had to bring on the Army Estimates for the quarter. It was the first official speech I had ever made, and I had to deal with many figures, not of speech, but of financial detail. Indeed, I was publicly complimented by Sir Henry Hardinge, and was cheered by all sides of the House. Mr. Baring¹ told me privately that he was surprised at my familiarity with accounts. The truth was that I had been exceedingly well "crammed," as the Cambridge students say; and I repeated my lesson fluently and accurately.

Hume tried to put me out, and talked of reducing 20,000 men from the vote, and of regiments being commanded by boys; and, when convicted of extravagant statements, said, as usual with him, "Well, I think so, and others think differently; that's all." I soon found that there was no arguing with this gentleman. He was like the bookseller's customer, who lost one of a set of books, and could never be convinced that he ought to find the volume, or buy the whole set.²

February 18.—I went to the great dinner at the Mansion House, given to Lord Grey and the Ministers. The French Ambassador, Talleyrand, was there with his niece; a wonderful-looking man, apparently only half alive. He was a good deal engrossed by talking and listening to Roth-

¹ Afterwards Lord Ashburton.

² The story is told by Addison.

schild—in his way, almost as extraordinary a personage as the French Prince. Talleyrand's health was proposed, and drunk with acclamation. He rose and bowed, but did not say a word. Lord Grey made a long speech, expressing his determination to carry Reform, and saying he did not consider failure, in that respect, as possible. 1832.

February 20.—I had a good deal of conversation with Lord Munster, whom I thought worth listening to. He told me that the general opinion at Court was that the Reform Bill would pass, but that the Government would not last long; Joseph Hume would involve them in some of his democratic schemes, which H.M. would not tolerate. “He himself,” Lord M. added, “had been always a Reformer; but he thought the Bill had gone too far.” I knew this gentleman pretty well. He was a man of a certain amount of capacity, with a good deal of active energy; but, as I understood from good authority, not very manageable, nor calculated to lessen the difficulties of his own position.

FROM DIARY.

February 21.—Lord Althorp and I went to Lord Grey and discussed with him my project for reduction of the force in the Colonies, and one or two other minor reforms. Althorp agreed with me beforehand that we should insinuate our proposal gradually—begin with the smallest

1832. item, and end with the reduction of the force, to which we thought the great man would be the most averse. We did so; and it was amusing to observe how we cajoled the good man for his own good, and obtained his consent to do what was right against his own inclination. He requested me to go to Sir Herbert Taylor, and sound him as to the abolition of the Riding Establishment at St. John's Wood—a foolish pet child of the Duke of York.

February 22.—I saw Sir Herbert Taylor, with whom I had a long conversation on the Riding Establishment, and agreed with him to remove the School to Maidstone, if it could not be done away with altogether.

I afterwards went to the King's first Levee. It was very much crowded. The heads of the Opposition party were there. The Duke of Wellington read an address to His Majesty against Reform. This unusual proceeding did not please the King, and it made every one of our side very angry. The Duke of Wellington looked worn and ill.

I had a long conversation with Lord Durham, who was again in the greatest alarm at the delay in making Peers; and says that with the King's repeated consent to the measure, and without any guarantee from the Harrowby and Wharnccliffe party, it is madness to hesitate. The Duke of Sussex joined us, and held exactly the same language. "Pray tell the King," said Lord

1832.

Durham. "I do," said the Duke; "and pray tell Lord Grey," added H.R.H. "I have, and it is no use," rejoined his Lordship. I begged Lord Durham would let me know in time to save myself, for as the coach was to be upset I should certainly jump off first.

I could not help admiring the quantity of fine equipages, and fine clothes, and smiling faces; and almost all belonging to persons who believe themselves, and perhaps are, on the brink of destruction; for that a great and deadly struggle is at hand, no man can well doubt; and all those who do not feel horror at the creation of Peers are equally alarmed at the consequences of refusing to do so. I spoke to many on the subject; amongst them Lord Cleveland, who owned to me he saw no security except in the creation of Peers; and he expressed most strongly his anxiety that it should take place. Even Lord, or rather Lady Stafford, holds the same language.

February 24.—I went to Lord Hill and Lord Fitzroy Somerset, and laid before them the project of reduction of the forces which had been agreed upon between Lord Althorp and myself. I felt myself justified in declaring it to be a proposal, not only of the War Office but of the Cabinet. Coming away I thought it better to intimate that the proposal should be considered quite confidential.

February 26.—A letter from Lord Althorp telling

1832. me that I have pressed Lord Hill a little too far in saying the King's Cabinet were determined on the reduction, and that Lord Goderich complained to Lord Grey of arrangements being made without him who was the War Secretary of State.

I was highly indignant at this letter, and answered it most decisively, saying that to me personally it was a matter of indifference what reductions took place so long as I was not a responsible Minister; but that as to this particular recommendation I could not permit any wrong notions to prevail as to my real position. I said I considered myself merely the organ, not the adviser of Ministers about the ensuing estimates, merely holding my place as an excuse for sitting on the Treasury Bench, and thereby giving myself a chance of being useful to the cause of Reform—my only object.

When I sent this letter I thought it not at all improbable that Lord Grey might say that he would not have any Secretary-at-War on those terms; and for this result I was not only prepared, but I contemplated it with no small pleasure, for though I will never desert these men so long as they do not abandon their own cause, nor treat me unfairly, still I should not, of course, be sorry to have a real excuse for extricating myself from a party whom I now find to be divided amongst themselves, and beyond the salutary advice of honest adherents.

I am quite sure that in the absorbing contemplation of their own interests, and whilst thinking as they well may do how to save their own necks, they do not bestow a thought upon a victim more or less of their own projects for patching up their power. They thought it a good thing for the moment to prevail on me to be their Secretary-at-War, but have never thought afterwards whether I was to sink or swim. Indeed, Lord Grey said to Althorp, "He (meaning me) will be no worse off than myself and all of us." Mighty fine! I, who have had no share, either of the enterprise or glory, if any, am to be overwhelmed by the defeat, and the country too!!!

February 28.—We had a grand struggle to-night on additional Members to the Metropolis. It seems that a party headed by Lord George Bentinck have been endeavouring to persuade certain moderate reformers to concede this point, in order to make the Bill more palatable to the Lords, and thereby avoid making Peers. We divided, and had a large majority of 80 against the modification.

Our set were much pleased, perhaps without reason, for if Lord Grey will not make Peers, and if this majority widens the breach between the middlemen and the Ministers, what is to become of us in the Lords? My own opinion, however, is, that the stronger we send the Bill to the Lords, the more sacrifices we can subsequently make, and the less they will probably demand.

1832. *March 2.*—Sir James Graham came to me about our Mutiny Bills, and then talked of the position of the Ministry. He was desponding. He said not only Grey was faltering, but Brougham was again sick, and even Althorp was not decided, besides which others of the Cabinet were divided against the creation of Peers. I said that the lives of the Ministry, to say nothing of their properties, would pay the penalty of a failure, and that the country would not allow them to walk out of office to their villas. He agreed with me, and with that sort of half-laugh which men put on when in alarm, talked of the revolution which was inevitable upon their retiring from office.

He told me he thought that Hardinge would be against our supplementary Mutiny Bill; but I think Graham, being a man of stratagem himself, is too apt to suspect deep designs in others.

I repeated this conversation to Lord Althorp, who replied, "Graham is always in the suds. Brougham is not sick again; when most calm he is most determined. We shall do; but come to-morrow, and we will have the sequel of our former conversation."

March 3.—Went to Lord Althorp's. We had a long conversation—not so encouraging as I had expected from what he had said the day before. It seems the King will allow them to make fifty Peers; that some doubts are entertained whether such a creation would not cause some of their own friends to vote against them; and

1832.

that this fear, as well as the repugnance to what they consider a revolutionary *coup d'état*, inclines the majority of the Cabinet to risk the second reading without making Peers, although, as yet, they have nothing like conversions enough to enable them to count upon success. They think they gain friends, but they are not certain—a few days would enable them to judge better of the lists; and, said Althorp, “I must decide what I will do—resign, because my colleagues will not make Peers, or stand the risk with them. If the latter, and we are beaten, I can never show my face again. If the former, I know the Government is dissolved, and the Bill is lost, and perhaps a revolution ensues.

“I tell you,” added the excellent man, with much feeling and earnestness, “I have long felt that uncontrollable circumstances were advancing me to a position to which my capacity is unequal; and I now feel that I have not the mind which is required for a man in my station. I do not allude to my conduct in Parliament. There, I think, I have succeeded in a line altogether new and untried before. I allude to my management out of the House, and more especially in consulting with my colleagues. Then I find I have not character enough for the great emergency out of which we are to extricate ourselves.”

I told him that, if he threatened to resign unless Peers were made before the second reading, the Cabinet would yield. “I do not know that,”

1832. said he; "they would rather go out with me; and then comes a revolution"; and he then added gravely, "I do not know whether I ought not to make matters easier by shooting myself." "For God's sake!" said I, "shoot anybody else you like."

I told him that, "if he went out even without his colleagues in the Cabinet, others would resign. I would not stay an instant after he was gone; nor would Poulett Thomson, nor Duncannon, nor even Edward Ellice." "Exactly so," replied Althorp, "and that is what I say—the Government will be destroyed; and, for all this, I shall be responsible. Better to shoot myself!" I repeated "that I would lay my life that, if he threatened to resign, his colleagues would yield." He still hesitated. He said that they were all agreed Peers should be made after the second reading, if they wanted them in Committee; but they wished to run the risk of the second reading. From this course he was, at present, averse, because he confessed he did not see his way, nor think that they had pledges enough to justify such a risk; yet he dreaded resignation as the certain commencement of national ruin. He added afterwards that he should think himself justified in regarding his own security in preference to that of his colleagues; and, consequently, unless he saw what any man of ordinary sense would call sufficient ground for being sure that the second reading would pass without

creation of Peers, Peers should be made, or he would resign, let what would come of it. 1832.

I urged every topic I could think of to induce him to abide by this determination. I combated the notion that making new Peers would disgust old friends ; and I said that, if fifty Peers were not enough to carry the Bill, I would make seventy. I did not deny that the measure was revolutionary ; but so was the Reform Bill, and I would not be frightened by a word. I confessed that, if I saw a certainty of carrying the second reading without Peers, I should prefer so doing ; but, if the slightest doubt existed, not a moment should be lost.

He seemed to agree with my view ; but added that some in the Cabinet were afraid of Lord Durham taking some violent step at once, and resigning. I replied, I did not think he would do any such thing ; he was too fond of office, as also were several of his colleagues. Lord Althorp remarked, I was right. Lord Althorp's concluding remark on this part of the subject was that his own impression was the Bill, somehow or the other, would pass.

Before I left, I heard from him that Attwood of Birmingham had been with him in a great fright at the state of his town ; "so," continued Althorp, "I was obliged to tell him all was safe." I confessed that such an assurance was an awkward addition to his difficulties. "Why, what could I say?" rejoined he. I owned that his position

1832. was a very difficult one; but still I could not help thinking such an assurance would certainly become public, and, if any mischief occurred, would be quoted against him. I found that Althorp thought our large majority on the Metropolitan Members clause made a compromise more difficult; yet he was persuaded that, if the second reading passed, the Bill was safe.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

I have been thus particular in recording this conversation, nearly verbatim, in order to convey some notion of the difficulties encountered by Lord Grey's Cabinet in passing the Reform Bill; and, more particularly, to give credit to him to whom most credit was due for accomplishing that great work. Lord Althorp was Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons; but he was something more—being possessed of the unlimited confidence of the great majority of the House of Commons, to say nothing of his well-earned reputation throughout the whole country. It is true that he was powerfully assisted in debate by Lord John Russell and Mr. Stanley; but he was the mainstay of Lord Grey's Government, and subsequent events proved how much importance was attached to his personal influence.

This same evening I presided at a public dinner of officers of the Army and Navy, met to inaugurate a new Society for maintaining a Library, Reading-room, and Museum for the use of the

armed professions. The day went off well, and the guests seemed pleased with their chairman. But here, again, I could not help contrasting my position with my political opinions; and I felt it would require much address, and more good fortune, to come out of the furnace unsinged. I think the best plan would be to pass through the fire, like the conjurers, as quickly as possible. 1832.

March 5.—Very hard words passed between Mr. Croker and Mr. Ewart in the House to-day. The latter told the former that his accuracy could be equalled only by his modesty and humility. Mr. Croker retorted, and defended himself against what he called the “low calumny” of his antagonist. I rose to stop him, and Stanley afterwards made up the difference.

I give this as a specimen of the language occasionally used in the unreformed House of Commons, as I read in some publication a most audacious assertion of the inferiority in good manners and decent behaviour of the Parliaments chosen since the passing of the Reform Bill.

FROM DIARY.

March 7.—I went to Lord Grey to settle about Army Reductions. After some talk about the best way of reducing Colonial forces, he said, “Upon my honour, I think we cannot reduce any of our force, and that gets rid of our difficulties.” To be sure; nothing so simple! I pocketed my papers, and Stanley being announced, took my leave.

1832. Another agreeable occurrence: I am sent to Lord Hill to propose a reduction of five thousand men. He hands to Lord Grey a counter project. After a fortnight's delay, Lord Grey gives up his reduction altogether, and thus takes part with his enemy the Commander-in-Chief against his friend the Secretary-at-War, leaving me discomfited in my efforts to do him and the country a service.

I told Lord Althorp that under any other than the present circumstances I would not remain in office an hour on such conditions; but poor Lord Grey was evidently thinking of his Reform and his Irish Tithes, and was glad to get rid of his Army Estimates at any terms.

March 10.—Lord Althorp asked me to walk home to Downing Street with him, “in order,” said he, “to talk *de summa rerum*.” This was the only time I ever heard him use a Latin phrase.

He told me that he had laboured hard to prevail on the Cabinet to create Peers, as the only safe mode of accomplishing their great object; for, if they proposed making fifty Peers, and the King refused, and they went out, and the Bill was lost—they, however, would not be lost, nor the country convulsed, and Reform would come by their return to power; also, if they made fifty Peers, and yet were overpowered in the Lords, just the same result would follow, for the country would stand by them, and the Bill be carried finally. But if they were beaten

in the Lords, without making Peers, everything would be lost—the Bill, their character, and the country too. 1832.

To this the opponents in the Cabinet reply that, they have a moral certainty of carrying the second reading of the Bill by 14 to 20 majority, and after that, Peers, if wanted, might be created.

This did not satisfy Lord Althorp, nor Brougham, who certainly acts with Althorp. Then comes the question, should Althorp resign? He has ascertained that his threat to do so would not induce the others to make Peers, it would only make them resign; then would follow the loss of the Bill, and perhaps a convulsion in the country. "But," said Althorp, "my own character would undoubtedly be saved. However," he continued, "a man under certain circumstances ought to sacrifice his character for the sake of his country." I said, of course he ought, but then he should be sure that his country was to be the gainer, and I did not see how that would be the case now.

Althorp evidently agreed with my view of the question, but showed he did not know how to extricate himself from his individual difficulties. He said that on any other question than this he should say that Government had a certainty of success, but on this his mind misgave him. He should, however, insist on some demonstration in the House of Lords previously to the second reading, in order to be sure who were going to vote

1832. with them. He added that a day or two would decide what was to be done, and he would let me know immediately.

We then turned to other topics, and Lord Althorp observed to me that no Administration could stand against an Opposition of 250 Members, organised as our antagonists were, and ready to vote factiously on every occasion, and that nothing but a dissolution after the passing of the Reform Bill could save them.

We then had a conversation on my office. He agreed with me that, if the Bill passed, a thorough reform should take place in the management of the Army; and that no man of honour or independence would consent to be Secretary-at-War without it.

Althorp told me before that, when the Whigs came in, he wanted Parnell to be Chief Lord Commissioner of the Treasury. Parnell wrote back that there was only one place he could take, and that was Chancellor of the Exchequer. "Now," said Althorp, "to write this to the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a little too much." I think so.

I went away pondering on my own position, whether I ought to resign now, for I see the Bill is to be risked, which is not the condition on which I came into office. I think my character is at stake. How am I to save it in the general wreck? It may be selfish to think so much about it, nevertheless I do think of it daily and nightly.

1832.

I dined at Lansdowne House. Lord Plunket there; silent, and rather sulky, at least looking so. He told me he supposed the Bill was safe. Lady Charlemont and Lady Kenmare there also, each of them, though in different ways, looking very beautiful.

March 11.—The Duke of Wellington sent me an Essay on flogging soldiers. It seemed to me very well written. He says *the British soldier must be the best in the world*, meaning, I presume, that there is a sort of moral necessity for this superiority, not that it is inevitable from physical circumstances that he should be so.

I am striving hard with Lord Hill to modify military punishment, and as I cannot do away with flogging, at least to put it under strict regulations.

March 12.—I asked Ellice what he thought of our chances for the second reading in the Lords without Peers. He tossed up his glove and said, *Just this*. On which I said that in that case I conceived the Administration was mad.

March 13.—Went to Lord Durham, who had sent to see me very urgently.

He told me the story of his division with his Cabinet friends on Sunday, and read to me four resolutions which he had moved on that occasion; the first three declaratory of the insufficiency and unsatisfactory calculation for the majority on the second reading, and the fourth declaring the necessity for an immediate creation of Peers.

1832.

He said that the majority of the Cabinet agreed with him in the first three propositions, but was not prepared to go out upon them. However, when the Duke of Richmond insisted upon going to the vote, all were against the motion, and he stood alone. He showed me the paper on which the pencil marks were made. On this he resolved to resign, and had written a letter to Lord Grey; but in the meantime came a member of the Cabinet, no other than Lord John Russell, and said that if Lord Durham went out, he would resign also. Seeing that the Cabinet would be broken up and Reform certainly lost, Lord Durham resolved to remain in office.

Then he told me that this was the dark side of the picture, but there was a brighter. He did really think that the second reading would be carried. His course had done good; even Palmerston had declared he would stand by the franchise. Goderich had assured him that the Metropolitan Members should not be given up, and Lansdowne also; moreover, all were agreed upon making Peers after the second reading, if necessary. The majority is expected to be twelve. The King is bestirring himself, which he did not do before.

Brougham is ill and out of sorts. He used to laugh and play off Palmerston and his speeches, now he sits silent.

Lord Durham showed me the letter which the King wrote to Lord Grey when he agreed to

dissolve the late Parliament, *verbosa et grandis*, 1832.
stating all his objections, and consenting only because he thought a change of Ministry prejudicial to England and to Europe, merely as change. He expressed that he had the same regret to see the Duke of Wellington go out of office. There was a civility and kindness, and approbation of Lord Grey's conduct, but still no great regard shown; and the King positively enjoined Lord Grey to take care that there should be no stronger Reform Bill than before, no violence tolerated, and Ireland was to be kept quiet.

Lord Grey employed Lord Durham to write his answer, which he showed me. It was very well done, and bound the King to Reform in as civil and respectful terms as possible. Lord Grey seems to have thought much of the letter, for in a note to Lord Durham he calls it "perfect."

Durham told me that the King had never forgiven him a letter written on the subject of dissolution, shown by Sir H. Taylor to His Majesty. The King never speaks to him at Council, all which he bears, he says, for love of the cause.

Lord John Russell called at the War Office, and talked an hour with me on the same subject as that with Lord Durham. I told him my mind freely, and also what I thought of Lord Grey and some of his colleagues, to which he more

1832. than half assented. He agreed that, if they were defeated, the least that would happen would be "eternal infamy" for them; but, added he, "you are on velvet." "Yes," I said, "I should be reckoned only a dupe."

I collected nothing satisfactory from him except that his impression was the Bill would pass the second reading. At any rate, he thought Reform safe even if the Ministry went out, for no anti-Reforming party would control the present House of Commons.

The Tories are now convinced that Reform is inevitable; and one of them said to Lord Durham to-day, that it was no use throwing out this Bill, for if they did another would be brought in on a more extended basis by Sir J. Hobhouse.

•

CHAPTER XIII

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

March.—In those days Ministers had much to contend with beyond their Parliamentary difficulties. For example, the letters of several active politicians were opened at foreign Courts, particularly at Paris; and, if they contained anything the authorities thought worth communicating, were copied and sent to London. One copy was always sent to His Majesty, another to the Prime Minister, and another to the Home Secretary. One of Joseph Hume's letters was thus forwarded in triplicate. The imprudent man wrote of the Reform Bill as being a good measure so far as it went, and as certain of producing a better, accompanied by the destruction of our Church Establishment. This angered King William exceedingly, and did not add to his attachment to the Grey Cabinet. 1832

FROM DIARY.

March 14.—I went to the Levee, and afterwards had an audience of the King. Received very civilly indeed. After some talk he ordered me to remove the Biding Establishment to the

1832. Maidstone Depot. We then talked about Sandhurst. He agreed with me that it ought to pay its own expenses, but when he heard that the Duke of Wellington and the Board, who have been inquiring into this subject, were against that plan being carried entirely into effect, he told me to settle the question with Lord Hill, saying that he was glad to find that we agreed so well together.

I spoke to him as freely as I thought decent, and told him that, although the objections to these establishments might rise from prejudice, and although the saving would be small, yet it would be advisable to give way where concession would not be injurious to the service. The King said certainly, and the saving, however little, would show the inclination of Government to be economical. He told me that he was for increasing rather than diminishing the establishments in question, but not at the public expense. I ventured to say that I should want every assistance which His Majesty might afford to me, and I hoped that in any amicable contest with the Horse Guards His Majesty would support his Secretary-at-War. The King said nothing, but did not appear displeased.

From what I have seen of the manners of the King, not to me personally, but to others, my impression is that he does not like his present Ministers.

Lord Hill and I had some talk after the Levee.

1832.

He showed the report of the Duke of Wellington's board. I said since His Grace had been so good as to settle this estimate for me, I presented my respectful compliments to him and requested him to arrange all the rest for me. The Commander-in-Chief looked a little red, and did not relish the joke.

This night, in the Commons, we got through the Committee on the Reform Bill, and fixed the third reading for the following Monday.

March 16.—Lord Althorp tells me that a friend of his has seen a letter from Lord Mansfield to a correspondent in Paris, in which was this expression: "The Bill will be carried by a very small majority, which will be the less of two evils; as rejecting it would cause a convulsion."

March 17.—Dined at S.S.B.S., where I met Mr. Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd. He was a good-natured, broad, and sandy-faced man, sang his own songs, and made excellent whisky-punch.

Macleod of Macleod was at this party, and he told me of the poetical Shepherd, that he met Sir Robert Peel at dinner at his (Macleod's) house, and said, "Faith! Sir Robert, I heard you praised by both sides the other night; I hope you are not going to rat!" Peel did not like it at all. Afterwards Peel asked Hogg if he had ever been in the House of Commons? Hogg said he had; but he had never heard those whom he wanted to hear—he had never heard Sir Robert

1832. Peel. On this Peel smiled, and said he would take him down that evening, and would speak; on which Hogg replied, "Thankye, no; this is a wetter table than yours."

Hogg seemed to me to be a simple, funny fellow, and, on the occasion before alluded to, he told Sir Robert Peel it was of no use his sitting to oppose the Reform Bill any longer, "it looked just like ill-nature."

March 19.—At House of Commons, where third reading of the Reform Bill came on.

March 23.—The third reading of our Bill passed in a very thin House, amidst no cheers, at about one o'clock in the morning.

March 24.—Dining at Holland House, I found my Lady, in spite of our large majority, in very low spirits. She quite agreed with me on the probability of defeat; and said that Lord Holland had been for decisive measures from first to last, that the King was as true as true could be, and that the timidity of Lord Grey was unaccountable. Even if all went according to promise, Lady Holland said there could not be more than 8 majority.

Lord Holland repeated all my Lady had said—regretted that twenty Peers had not been made at Christmas; but even now Lord Grey persists in saying that by making sixty Peers he runs more risk of defeat than by not making one.

Lord Holland remarked that the prorogation was clearly to be used only on great occasions,

but this was the occasion. It was the sword of Goliath to be taken from the Temple¹ once in a century perhaps. He said he was sure the King was vexed that he had not been called upon to strike the blow; he liked such lively demonstrations of power, and he *disliked* the Tories. Both these facts I never heard before, if facts they be. The whole of this conversation was very unsatisfactory to me. I am sure the Cabinet anticipate defeat. 1832.

Lady Holland was peculiarly earnest, not to say pathetic: "My dear H." and "Dear H." at every sentence, and "Oh that we could retrace our steps." We agreed to put a good face on the matter, and so were merry as before. In the meantime the Tories predict that we shall beat them, which is more frightful still, for this was their cry last time.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

March 26.—I dined at Kensington Palace with the Duchess of Kent. The party was numerous: Lord Durham, Lord and Lady Surrey, the Duke of Somerset and Lady C. St. Maur, Lord Radnor, Sir John Sebright, the Duke and Duchess of Leinster, and Sir John Conroy. The Princess

¹ No doubt the tabernacle is meant (see 1 Sam. xxi. 8, 9). David applied to Ahimelech at Nob for shewbread, and also for arms. And Ahimelech answered, "The sword of Goliath the Philistine, whom thou slewest in the valley of Elah, behold, it is here wrapped in a cloth behind the ephod: if thou wilt take that, take it: for there is no other save that here. And David said, There is none like that; give it me."

1832. Victoria sat on her mother's right hand. Sir John Conroy, the Controller of H.R.H.'s household, sat at the bottom of the table. Lord Durham handed the Duchess in to dinner.

The young Princess was treated in every respect like a grown-up woman, although apparently quite a child. Her manners were very pleasing and natural, and she seemed much amused by some conversation with Lord Durham, a manifest favourite at Kensington.¹

After dinner the Duchess of Kent came up to me in the drawing-room, and talked to me about her daughter. H.R.H. said "it was a most anxious charge. She did her best, and hoped that her expectations would not be disappointed." I took the liberty of saying that the nation looked up to her, and that, from the success which apparently had attended her previous endeavours, there was every reason to hope that her daughter would be everything that England could desire. The Duchess asked me if I did not think the Princess like the Royal Family? I replied that the upper part of her face was like that of the Princess Charlotte, but the mouth and chin of a better shape.

When she left the company she curtsied

¹ An interval of thirty-three years, a reign of twenty-eight years—some of them in very difficult if not dangerous times—and the greatest of all calamities that can befall a woman and a Queen, have not deprived her of the smile, the kind and gracious smile, which charmed me in those long by-gone days, and with which she received an old subject and servant only two days ago. (B., May 15, 1865.)

1832.

round very prettily to all the guests, and then ran out of the room. What will become of this young, pretty, unaffected child in a few, few years?

I was present this afternoon in the House of Lords when Lord John Russell brought up the Reform Bill. The new gallery was crowded with ladies, the Throne covered with Members. The body of the House was tolerably full; but the interest was nothing like so great as when the first Bill was brought up, nor did Russell put it into the Lord Chancellor's hands with a solemn speech, as before.

Lords Harrowby and Wharncliffe made their declaration of voting for the second reading; and they confessed that the country contained no party prepared for a total rejection of the measure. The Bishop of London made a bolder and a better speech. He said he should have voted for the second reading of that Bill, and he should vote for the second reading of this Bill; also that he would not, in Committee, propose any change that would affect the principle of the Bill. Lord Carnarvon made an angry speech against Lord Harrowby; and then Lord Grey made an excellent speech—temperate, but determined, and in his best manner. He fixed Thursday week for the second reading. The Duke of Wellington spoke shortly this evening, and said he should oppose the second reading.

March 28.—I called on Lord Althorp. He had

1832. just returned from the Levee. "It is all right," said he; "the King will do it. If we are beaten the Parliament will be prorogued, and we shall make eighty Peers the next day. The Cabinet are unanimous on that point." I wished him joy, and told him "that now, indeed, they were on velvet." He agreed that they were, and he added that "His Majesty was much pleased at not being pressed to make Peers before the second reading." I remarked that this did not correspond with what Lord Holland had told me. I then learnt that Lord Holland had not much influence with the King, notwithstanding their family connection; and I afterwards heard from good authority that no one of the Cabinet had much influence with His Majesty except Lord Grey.

March 30.—I brought in my Mutiny Bill, and the next day read it a second time.

April 2.—We went into Committee on the Mutiny Bill. Mr. Hunt—the Mr. Hunt—moved to leave out what he called corporeal punishment from the Bill. I felt very uncomfortable, but resolved to tell the exact truth; which I did by saying that I was as much against flogging in the Army as ever; that all the authorities I had consulted were on the other side; and that, as I did not frame the Mutiny Bill, I could not help the continuance of the practice.

Sir Henry Hardinge followed me, saying I was, "as Secretary-at-War, responsible Minister for the Mutiny Bill and Articles of War." This got up a

cheer against me, and, truth to tell, I felt in a very unpleasant predicament, which I had foreseen when I took office; for, though I was not the framer of the Mutiny Bill, I was the Minister officially bound to defend it, and, if I could not defend it, I was bound to give up my office. 1832.

Strange to say, Hunt, either from indifference or generosity, did not press his motion to a vote, and I was “*quitte pour la peur*.” I hardly knew how I could have brought myself to vote against him.

April 4.—The King now hesitates about making the requisite number of Peers, and said he never meant an unlimited number, and thought twenty-five would be enough, yet His Majesty certainly empowered Lord Grey to show to Lords Harrowby and Wharncliffe a letter from him to Lord Grey in which the power of making Peers, without any stated limit, was given to him. Lord Althorp confessed to me that he did not understand the King to have had any reserve on this point; but, said Althorp, “Kings are kings, even the best of them.”

We then recurred to the old topic. Lord Althorp thought the second reading would be carried by a small majority; but Ministers would be beaten on the first clause, where fifty-six boroughs were condemned to be disfranchised. On being beaten, they would propose to make sixty Peers—the King would refuse; they would resign. Sir R. Peel would come in, and would

1832. propose a moderate Reform Bill, which they would support. By this process he thought no serious damage would be done to the character of the Whig Party, and something would be gained for the cause of Reform. I disagreed with this view, and told him that the People would not understand why, when they had the power, they did not make a sufficient number of Peers; for this could not be explained without a reference to the wishes and conduct of the King.

Lord J. Russell called, and we had a talk on the Bill. He agreed that our prospects were gloomy, but said very truly that, as the Government had not carried their measure by force, they ought not to hesitate about concession. It would be foolish to go out because they were beaten on the number of boroughs, which Althorp thought ought to be the test.

April 5.—Dining with Sir Francis Burdett, I met Prince Czartoryski, and another Pole, a patriot and a poet, whose name I did not hear distinctly. The Prince was one of the most attractive men I ever met; he had an air of noble resignation, which never deserted him in any emergency. The poet was a lively old man of very engaging manners.

We had some conversation on Cutlar Fergusson's¹ proposed debate on Polish affairs. I

¹ Robert Cutlar Fergusson, Judge-Advocate-General, M.P. for Kirkcudbright.

1832.

thought it right to mention that neither the Parliament nor the public took much interest in foreign affairs, except so far as they affected the funds. The Prince seemed to agree with me, and said we wanted the will more than the power to befriend the Poles.

He called on me the next day, and he seemed much surprised to find that any apprehensions were entertained about carrying our Reform Bill. He also assured me that the English had not an adequate opinion on their own European influence. I confessed that I was not aware of that deficiency in their character.

April 7.—This was to me a memorable day, for, dining at our S.S.B.S., I heard from Lord Saltoun a most interesting account of the exploits of the Guards at Hougoumont, and of the battle of Waterloo towards the close of that great day; and, being at the Speaker's Levee in the evening, I was introduced to the Duke of Wellington. He was most kind, and encouraged me to talk about his sporting pursuits, and the falls he had had hunting. I could not help congratulating him on looking so well, and told him that he would want all his health for the campaign of next week, when the Reform battle was to be fought. He laughed, and said, "Oh, our House is not so bad as yours; we call half-past nine late."

April 8. Sunday.—A large party dined with me: Lord Hill, Lord Fitzroy Somerset, Sir James

1832. Kempt, Sir Willoughby Gordon, Sir John Macdonald, Lord Althorp, Duke of Leinster, Prince Cimitile, Mr. Vanderweyer, my friend Methuen, Lord Killeen, and Macaulay. It was a sort of official dinner, and, as the saying is, went off pretty well.

Sunday dinners were not then reckoned sinful.

April 9.—I went to the House of Lords, and heard part of Lord Grey's speech introducing our Reform Bill, and commenting on the Duke of Buckingham's fine project for Reform, which is not likely to allure a single soul. On Tuesday I went again to the Lords, and heard the Duke of Wellington declare in favour of some Reform.

The King came to London this day, in order to be in readiness to prorogue Parliament if the Bill should be lost, so they said; and Lord Althorp again told me, "All was right." But the concluding sentences of Lord Grey's speech the day before were rather desponding.

April 11.—I went to the Lords, and heard the continuation of the adjourned debate. Phillpotts of Exeter made a most furious harangue in opposition. Lord Durham answered his speech the next day, charging him with telling untruths and speaking pamphleteering slang. Phillpotts spoke again, and charged the Government with being connected with the *Times* newspaper. Lord Grey disclaimed this, and accused the Bishop of slander and want of charity.

FROM DIARY.

April 13.—I went into the Lords, and heard Lord Carnarvon. The House was not so full as on the last Reform Bill discussions, and the speaking was not so lively; indeed, I thought it much more dull. There were many ladies in the gallery, and many Members of our House on the steps of the Throne and at the Bar. Sir James Graham and Stanley were amongst them, more anxious-looking, I thought, than became Cabinet Ministers. This certainly was a most momentous occasion, it must be confessed; but, personally, I cannot say I felt the least anxiety, for to tell the truth I should not dislike a decent excuse for quitting my absurd office. However, the rejection of the Bill would be most calamitous for England and all Europe. 1832.

April 14.—At breakfast we heard newsmen crying something, and shortly after I heard that the second reading had been carried by nine. Well done Lord Althorp's calculations; and well done Lord Grey's adherence to his own persuasion that he could safely risk this great struggle without a creation of Peers!

The division took place at twenty-five minutes to seven this morning. For second reading:

	Contents.	Non-contents.
Present . .	128	126
Proxies . .	56	49
	<hr/> 184	<hr/> 175

1832. Every one was in high spirits. Lord Grey was extolled as the boldest and best of statesmen, and certain to hold office for life. Seeing Lord Melbourne, I congratulated him on the triumph of the second reading. He said it had been a most nervous moment. He did not think that all was over yet. I told him I thought that having weathered the great storm the rest of the voyage would or ought to be prosperous; also that they ought not to be pertinacious about the clauses in Committee, for let the Lords mutilate the Bill as they pleased, it would still be ten times more radical than Lord Brougham's scheme in 1830.

I hear Lord Grey's concluding address was splendid, and most forcible at the conclusion. He seemed to rise with the occasion. The report made him very lofty and energetic; but at the same time, very prudent, for he is evidently preparing for some concession about the £10 franchise or to the schedules.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

This day Prince Czartoryski and his poetical friend dined with me; I asked Warburton, Shiel, Hudson Gurney, George Sinclair, Bickersteth, and Ronald Ferguson to meet them. I attempted to convince them that the English are not the sort of people which the writers in reviews and newspapers represent them to be—*i.e.* are not eager to sympathise with, at least not to fight for,

1832.

the friends of liberty in other countries. They would hardly believe me; and when I told them that I did not think Cutlar Fergusson's speech in the ensuing week would produce much effect, N. said, "Oh, give us a few 'hear, hears,' at least; it will be some encouragement to us." The patriot poet was a most interesting old man of seventy-four years old, but with all the liveliness of youth.

Lady Julia, who dined with us, being somewhat better, said very truly that it was impossible to look at these men without feeling a mournful interest in them which is too painful for mixed society.

April 16.—At House of Commons. Joseph Hume, in a speech on Brazilian aggressions, said that, since the Whigs had been in office, the British flag had been disgraced in every quarter of the world. I often thought that this man was totally careless about his own assertions, as well as what had been said or done by others. This appeared to me strange enough in any politician; but, in a man of long experience, and much reputation, and very high popular position, I thought it totally inexplicable.

FROM DIARY.

April 18.—At the Levee. The King paid marked attention to the Duke of Wellington, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Rosslyn,

1832. and, in short, to the anti-Reformers. Our friends seemed out of sorts. Nevertheless, when I spoke to Althorp this evening in the House of Commons, he said that there was no cause for despondency, and I have heard that Lord Grey is in good spirits. However, that something has happened at headquarters I feel sure, and the Tories begin to lift up their heads again.

The House of Commons adjourned to the 7th of May.

April 24.—The Cholera killing its thousands at Paris ; here it is nearly extinct.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

May 3.—I presided at a dinner of the Literary Fund Club, where one of the guests was Sir John Swinburne, a well-known traveller and a remarkable man. He told us one or two curious stories, which I thought worth recording. He was travelling to Berlin in the year 1786, when a French gentleman, whose carriage had broken down, asked for a seat with him. Sir John consented : a large, round, pock-marked, powdered beau, in silk stockings dirtied to the ankles and a white handkerchief tied round his head, entered the carriage, and kept up a most agreeable conversation with him for the remainder of the journey. This was Mirabeau, going on the secret mission to Berlin of which he published so curious an account. Whilst at Berlin Sir John Swinburne soon heard that Mirabeau, notwithstanding all

his adroitness and pretending to be a persecuted man, had been found out by Prince Henry, who told Swinburne that the Frenchman was a spy. He borrowed £50 of Swinburne, in order to keep up the farce, although his pockets were full of money. After all, he did not accomplish his main object of giving the first intelligence of the death of Frederick; for the gates were closed, and a rocket gave the first signal of the event, which was passed on to Paris. 1832.

Sir John told two anecdotes of Lord Townshend, when Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. At one of his dinners at the Castle, a notorious Jacobite was sitting next to him when he gave the King's health, and, speaking to his neighbour, said, "Not your King, but my King." The Jacobite, not the least disconcerted, turned to the gentleman next to him, saying, "Pass the Lord Lieutenant's toast, 'The King—not your King, but my King.'"

Another story: Lord Townshend at dinner one day observed a very ugly man, a Major in the Army, sitting at the bottom of the table. He took a card, and drew a caricatured likeness of the Major. This was handed from guest to guest until it reached the officer, who very quietly turned the card, and, drawing a likeness of the Lord Lieutenant, had it handed up to him. Lord Townshend the next day sent for the gentleman, and, finding he was a meritorious officer, promoted him.

May 7.—Parliament resumed its sittings. This

1832. was the period of the crisis which was to determine the fate of the Grey Government and their Reform Bill.

FROM DIARY.

May 7.—The streets were placarded :

“Seventh of May,
Crisis Day”—

alluding to the debate in the Lords on committal of the Reform Bill.

I went to the House of Lords, and heard that Lord Lyndhurst had proposed to take the enfranchisement clauses of the Bill before the disfranchisement clauses; and that Lord Grey had declared such a course would be fatal to the Bill; that Lords Harrowby, Wharncliffe, and others had declared in favour of Lyndhurst; and that Ministers would be in a minority of 20 or 25 at the least. Nothing was more unexpected than this news.

A great many friends supposed that a creation of Peers was now inevitable; indeed, even the other side held the same language, and seemed afraid of their certain victory. The House divided, and, for the first time, I saw the division : Lyndhurst 151; Ministers 116.

Lord Grey then postponed the further consideration of the Bill until Thursday. Of this Lord Ellenborough complained, and said he was willing to admit the disfranchisement of 113 seats, and that he preferred household suffrage

to the £10 qualification. This disclosure of the intention of the Tories to come in, and carry Whig Reform, drew forth a burst of eloquence from Lord Grey, who was loudly cheered by our friends, and then the House adjourned. I told several friends that Ministers were out. No one would believe me, but insisted that the King would create Peers. I told my wife with great glee, so far as I was concerned, that the Administration was at an end, for it had been beaten, and would resign. 1832.

May 8. Tuesday.—I packed up my papers at the War Office to be ready for a start, for I felt sure all was over. At half-past two Lords Grey and Brougham went to the King at Windsor, with a proposal to create a sufficient number of Peers. Graham and Stanley and all seemed in good spirits, and said that, if the Tories had been paid for it, they could not have acted more for the country and the character of the Ministers. They did not seem to be sure, or indeed to care much, about the result of the proposal.

Lord Dover told me that Lord Grey had hesitated about proposing to make Peers, and preferred offering to resign. At last he was persuaded to take the other line.

May 9. Wednesday.—Whilst I was getting up I received a note from Lord Durham marked "Immediate." It contained these words: "Half-past nine. The King has refused to make Peers, and has accepted our resignation."

1832. After breakfast I went to Lord Durham's, and he showed me the note just arrived from Lord Grey. "Dear Lambton, the King has accepted our resignations. Ever yours, G."

We went to the Levee together. The only person, almost, to whom the King said nothing at the *entrée* Levee was the Duke of Wellington. The Duke of Richmond and Lord John Russell, standing by me, remarked it; and said the King was wretched, and angry with the Duke of Wellington. I said, "Just the contrary; I would bet anything the Duke was Prime Minister."

I talked with all the honest resigners, and shook hands with Lord Grey most warmly. He said to me, "I could do nothing else; the Bill was taken out of my hands; I was no longer Minister." We were all very merry, for undone dogs, as we were; and, when the Levee was over, the question was, what was the formality of resignation? No one seemed to know; but, at last, we were told that the King would see only those of the Cabinet who had particular business with him. Lords Grey, Lansdowne, Goderich, Palmerston, Duke of Richmond, and Lord Althorp went in one by one; and the Lord Chancellor came so late that some thought he was not coming at all. I was told that the King was very gracious, and wept, taking leave of Palmerston and Goderich, if not of others. He pressed Brougham and the Duke of Richmond to stay in office. The Duke of Richmond told

1832.

me that he had got nothing by being in office, except the *entrée* for his two carriages. Lord John Russell told me he had been treated, before the Levee, with marked disrespect by the King, who did not speak to him, nor ask him to come in after the Levee. Nothing was known at Court about the new arrangements; but it appeared that Lord Lyndhurst was sent for after the Levee.

The House of Commons was very full. Ebrington gave notice of a call of the House, and an Address to the Crown, for the next day.

We adjourned, and I went to the Lords, where Lord Carnarvon was abusing Lord Grey *for deserting the King!!* Lord Grey made a very spirited answer, saying he would not consent to be the shadow of a Minister.

There was a great meeting at Brooks's, to consider Ebrington's Address. I had spoken to him about it, begging that it might be of a good decisive character, and that his speech would correspond with it. I told him, and Althorp too, that I did not approve of preaching patience, nor complimenting the King upon his conduct. Althorp replied that nothing should make him implicate the King.

I find the meeting at Brooks's was considered satisfactory. Ebrington, at first, proposed a milk-and-water Address, which was much improved upon.

May 10. Thursday.—Ebrington introduced his

1832. motion with a good strong speech. Baring made a clever, unfair speech, and moved the negative, calling on Lord Althorp to tell what his advice to the King had been. Althorp rose, and, in the most impressive manner, plainly and resolutely, said that Baring knew what the advice had been; but, if he wished to be told, it was this: to create a sufficient number of Peers to carry the Reform Bill, in an efficient form, through the other House of Parliament.

Here the most tremendous cheers burst from all quarters of the House, and lasted louder and longer than I ever recollect to have heard; indeed, the spirit of the Reformers was up during the whole debate, and evidently cowed the other side, and gave the lie to the rumour of our apostacy.

Peel was very feeble, and felt it, as did the House; he said nothing about Reform. O'Connell handled him roughly. Macaulay made a good speech; but, as Burdett said, too like Coach-makers' Hall. We then divided, thinking we had a majority of at least a hundred; but we came in 288, the numbers inside being 208. The Opposition, particularly Lord Chandos, cheered as if they had gained a victory; and Sir Richard Vyvyan, amidst the laughter of us and ours, talked of the smallness of our majority. We went away, well pleased, about twelve o'clock.

May 11. Friday.—Rumours that Peel and the Duke of Wellington are in negotiation with

Lord Lyndhurst; the greatest possible excitement prevailing everywhere. A large Westminster meeting at Crown and Anchor, and meetings in the City. At House of Commons very sharp debates on presenting petitions, and everything announcing some crisis. The Duke of Wellington said to be Minister. 1832.

May 12. Saturday.—For a short time at W.O. [War. Office]. Sir James Graham called out under the window that everything was settled, and that the Duke of Wellington was Minister; Baring Chancellor of the Exchequer; Murray, Hardinge, etc., in office; and Parliament to be dissolved on Monday.

I went to Lord Grey, and saw him for a short time. He spoke to me about his resignation, and seemed very much affected by the tributes of esteem and respect offered to him from every part of the country. He told me that a Birmingham man had burst into tears before him; he said that Reform of Parliament was, in his view, like Catholic Emancipation, the removal of a stumbling-block, and not a cure for all evils. He had done his best to pass the measure, and when he failed, went out.

May 13. Sunday. — It seems the Duke of Wellington is the chief, or, at least, the framer of the Ministry; and, from something that A. Baring said to me on Friday, I think *he* is Chancellor of the Exchequer. In the meantime the spirit is roused all over the country, and

1832. seems likely to end in mischief. I saw Tavistock to-day, and walked a good deal with him; he is completely benighted, I think, and supposes everything is to go off quietly. Peel, Croker, and Goulburn, all have declined office under the Tory Reformers; for it now turns out we are to have the Bill and the Duke of Wellington!!! Almost incredible; but true.

I went to a meeting at Brooks's where Lord Ebrington proposed another Address to the Crown, against the Duke of Wellington, but he eventually withdrew his proposal. The truth was, many of our people were afraid of a dissolution, and thought an Address would bring it on. I was afraid that, if we relaxed, the People would distrust us; and, besides, the Tories would find means to fritter away our opposition.

I had a letter from Sir Herbert Taylor to-day, expressing the King's regret at losing my services, and his satisfaction with my civility, etc., and appointing me to call on him the next day.

May 14. Monday.—At half-past two I went to St. James's, and had my audience of resignation. The King was extremely civil; calling me "My good friend," "My dear sir," etc. He told me he knew I had too much property to lose, to wish for, or assist, any attempts at convulsion. I said, "Your Majesty has not a more loyal subject than myself." He replied, "I know it."

He then talked of various matters, of my father, of his intimacy with Lord Sidmouth, of the way

in which it began. He said Sidmouth was a good speaker, and an agreeable man, but not a Minister of great capacity. I told him of my father being present when Pitt made his first speech at the Bar. We then talked of the cholera, which, he said, he did not think had been bad in London; then asked whether I had a house in Wiltshire, and where I should settle in the summer; then, about the James Hays, and other trifling matters. 1832.

In conclusion, he said, "I will not take up more of your time; I have now seen you in public and in private, and I hope I may be permitted, occasionally, to keep up our acquaintance." I replied that he was very condescending, and bowed *backwards* out of the room. He was looking well, and in good spirits; and, when I told him so, he said, "Thank God, I was never better in my life." I thought he seemed pleased to be rid of his Whig tutors.

At House of Commons. Call of the House not enforced. Lord Ebrington, on London petition, commenced a fire on the Duke of Wellington, for accepting office to carry the Reform Bill. He called it a violation of public morality. Macaulay spoke much to the same purpose; T. Duncombe was more explicit, and spared no epithet of contempt. Peel was there, but said nothing, looking most miserable. Baring tried his hand, very badly: it appeared he was mouthpiece to Wellington. He was received with horse-laughter when he declared that the Bill must pass, and that

1832. Wellington was justified in passing it. The debate was most triumphant, if debate it can be called.

I came away at half-past seven. It appears the debate went on, afterwards, until eleven ; and that the Wellingtonians were so chapfallen that Burdett, Hume, and O'Connell recommended a cessation of hostilities, for the sake of a reconciliation between the King and the Whigs.

But the "coup de grâce" was given to the *phantom* Ministry by Inglis, who declared against such a dereliction of public honour ; and Wynne also said, if the Bill was to be carried, it ought to be carried by the Whigs. Even Hunt owned that nothing but the return of Lord Grey could tranquillise the country. Baring made a second speech in a different tone from his first speech ; so much so, it was thought he had heard from the Duke of Wellington, for he recommended reconciliation between the King and the Whigs. I suppose there was never before such a scene in Parliament.

May 15. Tuesday.—I called on Lord Althorp, when in came the Duke of Richmond, and said : "Well, I have bad news for you ; no shooting this year. Pack up your guns again. I have the intelligence from the Palace, and know it to be true. The Duke of Wellington has been with the King this morning, and given up his commission altogether."

At a quarter past four I went to the House

of Commons. There was much excitement in the streets and near the Houses of Parliament. The Duke's failure was generally known, but nothing was said about Lord Grey. 1832.

The House was very full and much expectation alive. Lord Althorp, Graham, Stanley, and Palmerston entered, and took their old seats. Baring then rose, and said that he had to tell the House that the Duke of Wellington's effort to construct a new Ministry had totally failed, and he hoped the new arrangements would be satisfactory.

Lord Althorp stated that Lord Grey had received a message from the King, and proposed adjourning the House till Thursday.

The greatest joy was apparent in the faces of all our friends, and even some opponents seemed rather pleased than otherwise; but we spared our baffled enemies. In the streets there was one universal look, and gesture, and language of delight.

I went to Francis Place; he was overjoyed, and said it was the greatest and most surprising Revolution in History. He told me there would have been a convulsion if the Duke had persevered. The demand for gold was increasing. Birmingham was preparing for resistance; and here, in London, there were symptoms of fighting. Now, he thought, all would be well. I told him not to be so sure of Lord Grey's return.

May 16. Wednesday. — I joined Alexander

1832. Baring in Berkeley Square, where we walked a long time together. He told me he had escaped a great honour. He was to be Chancellor of the Exchequer, but not Leader of the House of Commons. Peel's refusal to join them had been their first great obstacle. He thought Peel shabby for this, and did not understand his morality, or the difference between supporting the Tories in office, to carry the Reform Bill, and being in office himself. He supposed that Peel, as usual, thought chiefly of Peel.

He said that the Duke of Wellington had told him that he should think himself unfit to crawl on earth, if he did not stand by the King, even at the expense of his own consistency; and that he had resolved to carry the Reform Bill, as an inevitable measure, in all its great provisions; indeed, a Bill probably more extensive than that which Lord Grey would now grant.

Baring said that the King had resolved to pass the Reform Bill, and made that the condition of giving office to the Duke; what he objected to was the making of Peers. The Duke was not to have been Prime Minister.

Baring said that, if the mere love of office had been their object, it would have been better to have waited until the Reform Bill had passed, when the Whigs would probably have fallen, and the Tories or some others succeeded.

We then talked about what was to be done now. Baring said that it was all our own game

now. We should let the King down easily. We should modify the Bill a little; we should keep the peace. I said the first would be done; the second was rendered difficult, if not impossible, by the events of last week; for the Political Unions were now raised to an importance which rendered their immediate suppression almost impossible. Baring seemed to agree with me. I collected from his whole conversation that he considered the affair settled, and Lord Grey in office. 1832.

He told me that his second speech on Monday was not in consequence of any hint from the Duke; it was his own conviction that it was best to open a loophole of retreat for the Duke. When he sat down, Hardinge and Murray told him he was right; and the Duke told him the same, on the same evening, and resolved to give way. It was proposed to try a middle course, and a third party; but the Duke said, "No; if I do not succeed, the King had better send for Lord Grey at once. He will have to do it at last; and it is not right to keep the country in agitation during the interval." The King adopted this counsel. I took leave of Baring, saying, "You are a bold man." He replied, "You mean an impudent one."

I dined at Sir F. Burdett's. Lord Duncannon told me, after dinner, that the Cabinet had agreed not to retain office without the certainty of carrying the Bill, but they would not press too hard upon the King. This seemed to satisfy

1832. even Lord Durham, and Lord Duncannon said all would be well.

We had then some talk about Ireland, and Lord D. said I should be Secretary, with some new arrangement; but, in these times, 'tis absurd to think of individuals, or anything but the great national question.

May 17. Thursday.—I find disturbances in Westminster, and the panic returning. I went to the House of Commons, and there Ellice told me that the King had written to Lord Grey, stating that the Duke of Wellington, Lord Lyndhurst, the Dukes of Cumberland and Gloucester, and others, would make conciliatory speeches, which would enable the Reform Bill to pass without Peers being made.

I heard the Duke of Wellington state his case at the Lords; but so far was he from conciliation, or anything like withdrawing his opposition to the Bill, that every sentence was an attack either on Reform or Lord Grey. He did not say a word about his intended support of the measure, had he been Minister; but he did make use of the expression attributed to him by Baring, about his not deserting the King. Lord Lyndhurst followed him in a still more bitter speech, and did not show the slightest symptom of concession. I was near Ellice: we both stared, and he said that these men had deceived the King, for he had positively seen the King's letter; and Lord Althorp had announced, in the

Commons, that there was "every probability of the affair coming to a satisfactory result." 1832.

Lord Grey answered in a firm and manly speech, defending the creation of Peers, and stating that he was resolved not to retain office unless he could carry the Bill unmutilated. He spoke too handsomely of the King, and he refuted the Duke of Wellington's charge of leaving the King alone. Lord Mansfield spoke, and indignantly disclaimed the virtue, imputed to him by the *Times*, of rejecting the Duke's offer of office. I was satisfied that all was over, and I went to the Commons. I sat down next to Althorp, and told him what had passed. He said: "Well, so much the better; but it is rather a bore for me to have spoken with so much confidence, though I was quite justified in so doing. Now I shall have my shooting." "You may," I said; "so shall we. The pitchforks will be here." "Not here," he replied; "the other House." I said, "I don't care for that."

I found the Members of the House of Commons quite satisfied with the proceedings in their House, and could not persuade them that the Lords would not yield. They had written good news to all parts of the country.

May 18.—I see by the *Times* that the debate in the Lords ended as it began—no conciliation, and the order for the Reform Bill discharged. I went to the Treasury. Lord Duncannon showed me an Address for the House of Commons to the

1832. King, to make Peers. Lord Ebrington showed me one he had drawn up, for the same object, to be moved to-night, in case the Ministers retired finally from office.

Ellice told me that the King had written to Lord Grey this morning, stating his surprise at the conduct of the Opposition Lords last night. The Ministers are now in Cabinet, and, one way or the other, the business will be settled this evening.

I came down to the House of Commons at half-past four; found the call going on and every preparation for the Address. Nothing known, except that the Cabinet had agreed upon a minute, and that Lords Grey and Brougham had carried that minute to the King, and were with him at that moment. Althorp, Palmerston, Stanley, Graham, and Grant entered the House; but they knew nothing more. The call went on. Lord Milton came to Ebrington and me, pressing some change in the Address. We advised none, but, at last, Ebrington consented to go out with him to look at the alteration. The call was nearly over, when Tom Duncombe came to the end of the Treasury bench, where I was, and said, "All was done and settled." There was a great bustle—many complaints of the Ministers keeping the secret too long. Stanley was called out of the House, but presently returned and said to me, "All right!" When the call was over Lord Althorp rose, and, in one sentence, told the House "THAT MINISTERS, HAVING WHAT THEY

CONCEIVED A SUFFICIENT GUARANTEE FOR BEING 1832.
ABLE TO PASS THE REFORM BILL UNIMPAIRED,
RETAINED THEIR OFFICES.”

There was great shouting, and some waving of hats, particularly by O’Connell, who, by the way, has behaved very well in this great emergency.

Peel made a long apology for refusing office—every word of said excuse being an attack on the Duke of Wellington, whom, at the same time, he praised. He also lauded the talents and character of Lord Lyndhurst, whose name was received by a horse laugh.

Our friends cheered Peel, and when he sat down, Althorp rose, and said he was satisfied with the Right Hon. Baronet, of whom he thought as highly as ever. This very humiliating testimony to character, though given with good faith, made poor Peel look very foolish and sulky; he did not acknowledge Althorp’s civility, but blushed, and fidgeted, and was silent.

Alexander Baring then rose, and defended the Duke of Wellington. This defence, of course, was an implied censure of Peel. Never was such an exposure of a party; enough to satisfy the utmost malice, and forbid revenge. I went away. It seems that Vyvyan and George Banks added to the discomfiture of the enemy by two silly speeches.

Such, for the present, is the conclusion of this memorable interregnum, which has done more, in nine or ten days, to discover the real char-

1832. acter of the King, and the People, and the parties in the state, than could otherwise have been found out in as many years.

Lord Grey made much the same declaration in the Lords as Althorp in the Commons, and the Duke of Portland, and Lord Carnarvon, and other rabid Wellingtonians, gave further specimens of their spite.

In the evening I went to the Queen's Ball at St. James's. Our Ministers were there, and everybody else. Lord Lowther told me that the great blunder had been not coming out with the whole Ministerial arrangements on Monday last. They had been completed on Saturday, and, if they had been announced, many of our waverers would have gone over. I said I doubted if anything would have overcome the repugnance of the people to the Duke of Wellington. The truth is, the Tories cannot be persuaded of the spirit or real character of the people.

May 19. Saturday.—I went to Place. He told me that there would, positively, have been a rising if Wellington had recovered power yesterday. Everything was arranged for it; he himself would not have slept at home.

Stephenson told me that on account of a petition from Bristol, which the Duke of Sussex twice presented to the King, on Sunday and Monday last, H.M. wrote on Tuesday morning, at nine o'clock, a letter to H.R.H. forbidding him the Court!!! Now who did this? Wellington

1832.

was still thought to be Minister up to eleven on that day. Stephenson showed the letter to Lord Grey; something must be done about it. There are fears that the Duke of Sussex means to play the part of the Duke of Orleans; and yesterday an address came from the City, asking the Duke of Sussex to take charge of the City in case of disturbance. This address was shown to the King when they took the Cabinet minute to him. Who shall say what effect it had in securing an affirmative answer?

From all I hear it seems to me quite clear that H.M. must be considered as an irreconcilable enemy of the Ministers; and that, if there is the slightest chance of his escaping from them, he will. The Tories hope that we shall be embarrassed by the Irish Bill; and even now look to a Wellington or Peel administration. *Force, force, force*—that is, *Peers, Peers, Peers*—nothing else will save us and the country.

May 21. Monday.—The Lords went into committee on the Reform Bill. The Wellingtonians for the most part did not attend. Lord Grey got on with Schedule D as far as Wolverhampton. Thus the Tories, after describing the Bill as utterly destructive of Church and State and King and property, have given up their opposition to it rather than allow a *creation of Peers*, which could not, by any possibility, produce more mischief than the Bill, and which would

1832. have saved their honour by making them yield only to force (*i.e.* numbers).

May 22.—Charles Fox told me, when walking down to the H. of C. to-day, that a good deal of the late mischief had been caused by Lord Munster,¹ whom he called a lover of money, not a politician. He had not spoken to the King for eight months, but was recommended by G. Seymour, and helped to bring about the Duke of Wellington's foolish effort. "The other FitzClarences are with us," said Fox. "Munster and the Duke of Cumberland are now forbidden to talk politics at Court. The King has no liking nor disliking for Ministers—a good old man, but forgets what he says. He certainly had acceded to the making Peers, and the Duke of Wellington confessed it when he was shown the correspondence between the King and Lord Grey."

Fox said to the King, "By recalling Lord Grey, you have saved the country from civil war." "Yes," said the King, "for the present." Fox said that the Duke of Sussex had been imprudent in presenting the Bristol petition to the King. I think so too.

At H. of C., a long discussion on Free Trade. The Reform Bill in committee in the Lords.

May 23. Wednesday.—Went to the Levee.

¹ George Augustus Frederick FitzClarence, son of William IV. and Mrs. Jordan; served in the Peninsula and in India; created Earl of Munster 1831.

The returned Ministers there. The King did not seem very well pleased with his Court, and did not smile upon our leaders. 1832.

Lord Durham and I had a long talk; he spoke of affairs being in a very precarious state, and said that nothing but fear would keep the *governor* in order.

May 24. Thursday.—I had to go to a Children's Ball at St. James's. I did not think it so pretty a sight as I expected; there was a great crowd. Lord Byron re-introduced himself to me, after an estrangement of some years; he has some place about the Court. We had some friendly talk, but not a word about my friend and his cousin.

May 25. Friday.—At House of Commons, where I sat out debate on Reform. Divided 246 to 130. The spirit of the Conservatives is dead and gone.

In the Lords the Reform Bill went on swimmingly; nearly all over, except Schedules A and B.

This week Sir James Mackintosh died, at the age of 66. Sir Robert Inglis, who lived near him at Clapham, told me his last articulate words were, "I am happy." Pretty much the same were put into the mouth of Charles Fox on his death-bed.

May 30.—I went to the House of Commons, and looked in at the Lords, where the remaining clauses of the Bill were passed with very little opposition, and without any discussion.

1832. Edward Ellice told me that on Monday last the King wrote an angry letter to Lord Grey, complaining of the Irish Reform Bill being hurried on, and of the English Bill passing the Lords without amendments. To this letter Lord Grey, with the unanimous consent of the Cabinet, wrote a very decided answer. The poor King then wrote to say that his first letter had originated in mistake.

There is no doubt, nor concealment now, as to the real inclination, and, indeed, intentions of H.M. to turn out the Government if he can. He is angry at being hissed. He persists in forbidding the Duke of Sussex from Court.

May 31.—I went to the House of Commons, and sat up till near two in the morning. H.M. will not, they say, go to the House to give the Royal Assent to the Reform Bill. Add to these symptoms I hear, from good authority, Lord Grey himself remarked a change in the King's manner, even to him, before the resignation; and that manner has not altered since the return of Lord Grey to power. Sir James Graham confirmed this, and like the rest is prepared for quitting office. However, the Reform Bill made steady progress in the Lords.

The Tories are now preaching up Household Suffrage and equal division of districts, and are prepared for any extremity. They say the Monarchy is at an end.

June 1.—The report of the Reform Bill passed

the Lords this night after some furious follies from Lord Carnarvon. It is now certain there will be no attempt to throw out the Bill on the third reading.

June 2.—Lord Durham called on me at the War Office, and held language much calculated to alarm any one that gave him credit for foresight. He looked upon the King as little short of mad, and thought there would be some fierce struggle yet, unless the King died shortly; for he would try a new Government, and a return to the old system. He thought that some great change was inevitable, and that we ought to be prepared for it. He complained of some of his colleagues in the Cabinet, particularly of Palmerston, and from what I hear from Sullivan, Palmerston complains of him. This gives rise to rumours of dissensions in the Cabinet.

Lord Durham told me that the real reason of the King's quarrel with the Duke of Sussex was the Duke's refusal to dine with H.M. on the Wednesday, the day when the Grey Cabinet resigned. The Duke of Sussex and the Duchess of Kent were the only members of the Royal Family who did not dine with H.M. on that occasion. This made the King very angry; yet at his birthday dinner, Monday, 28th of May, he called the Queen back to hear him give a toast: "The Princess Victoria; and remember that I declare her to be the lawful successor to the Throne." This is one of the many extrava-

1832. gances attributed to him. Pray Heaven that he may continue sound until Thursday, June 7.

We had a large dinner party and opened our handsome drawing-rooms. How long for! Lord Dundonald dined with us, the Berrys, Lady Davy, the Maitlands, T. Creevey, Balfours, Fergusons, etc.; so we go on, even on the brink, so they say, of ruin and revolution.

June 4.—Debate on third reading of Reform Bill in the Lords. A little past ten a rumour reached us that the Lords were dividing. I ran away and got before the throne to the rail. Their Lordships were telling, and there was much confusion. Only two Bishops, Grey and Maltby, with us, two against us. Lord Brougham then read the numbers: 106 to 22, and after going shortly over the amendments, said, "*that this Bill do pass,*" and pass it did.

I returned to the Commons, where the Scottish Reform Bill was going on. Presently Martin and Adam, Masters in Chancery, came into the House with the Bill in their hands. There was a general murmur, and Alderman Wood made a foolish attempt to suspend our proceedings for the sake of having it brought up, but Althorp resisted, and we went on till half-past eleven, when Bernal left the chair, and the Masters brought up *the Bill* with several others. The Speaker took a malicious pleasure in confounding the Reform with some Church and Road Bills, and there was no cheering or other sign of exulta-

tion. Althorp moved that the amendments should be considered the next day, and we broke up. 1832

June 5.—Lord John Russell moved the second reading of the Lords' amendments of the Bill; and after a debate very much in our favour, they were agreed to without a division.

June 6.—At the King's Levee. Saw Palmerston invested with the Order of the Bath, which our gracious King forced upon him at his last visit to Windsor with Bülow. The Duke of Wellington, Lord Rosslyn, and the rest were in the ceremony, and did not look very merry, I thought. I saw the knighting, a silly barbarous farce.

The King does *not* give the Royal Assent in person to the Great Bill; a very foolish spite, which takes away the grace from what he wishes to be thought or did wish to be thought his own gift.

June 7.—Sad news from Paris. Another revolution. A regular battle between the people and the soldiery; the troops said to be worsted, and few National Guards fighting with them. The news completely upset me. A few hours more will announce who reigns in France. What advantage will our fools at home take of this dreadful event, and what a mercy for us that it did not happen during the interregnum! But the crisis is coming, and we must soon be at our posts. I hope I shall act as I ought. In the meantime our gay and gambling world are all gone to the Derby!!

I went down to the House early to hear the

1832. Royal Assent given to the Reform Bill, but was too late. It was just over. A little before four o'clock, the Speaker, attended by Lord John Russell and some thirty or forty Members, went to the Lords. The Commissioners were Lords Grey, Lansdowne, Holland, Wellesley, Durham, and the Lord Chancellor. Only our great Bill received the Royal Assent. The whole proceeding lasted but a short time, and was slurred over as quickly as possible. Not a single Peer was to be seen on the Opposition benches, and not more than nine or ten on the Ministerial side.

A very poor picture was painted, misrepresenting this scene, as I can assert; for I am placed there next to Sir Francis Burdett, whereas I was not in the House.

There were a few people collected about the doors of Parliament; but there was very little excitement. The Ministers were, however, cheered as they left the House.

Thus ends this great national exploit. The deed is done. It is difficult to believe that it is done. I was obliged to leave the House of Commons, being ill; but I see that, when the Boundaries Bill was discussed, Croker took occasion, as might be expected, to allude to Paris running in blood, just as our Reform Bill was receiving the Royal sanction.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

June 9.—I was attacked by a violent head-

ache, and, unluckily, had to entertain three of my masters at dinner—Graham, Goderich, and Palmerston. Lord Dacre and Sir Francis Burdett were of the party; and talked of Reform, which was not relished by two out of three of my Cabinet guests. 1832.

June 14.—I went to the drawing-room, where I was most ungraciously received by Queen Adelaide; but that did not prevent me from going to the Queen's Ball at St. James's the next evening—a very poor pageant; their Majesties sitting on a dais in a row, like monarchs in a playhouse. I thanked Heaven that this was the last of the season.

June 20.—The King was struck on the head with a stone, on Ascot race-ground, by a one-legged ex-pensioner of Greenwich. Both Houses voted addresses to him, and Sir Robert Peel could not resist the temptation to connect the outrage with some intemperate language of the press and speeches in Parliament.

FROM DIARY.

June 26.—There was a Review in Hyde Park, which was attended by the King and Queen. The Duke of Wellington was at the head of his regiment. He was cheered by the “mob of gentlemen,” but coldly received by the crowd. The Queen much hissed.

I afterwards went in full dress to a party at the Duke of Wellington's to meet their Majesties. A

1832. hundred or so of the Guards were drawn up in the courtyard, and the whole scene had a very military appearance; it was said that a thousand guests were present. The King made a long speech to the Guards when he gave them their new colours, and said Cæsar was the first Grenadier.

This is my first, and probably will be my last, appearance at the Duke's. His pistol-proof blinds are no proof of his wisdom, nor his broken, unmended windows.

June 27.—I went to the annual Westminster dinner. Sir Francis Burdett announced this to be the last: Reform having been gained, our occupation was over.

Daniel O'Connell was the hero of the evening; and he made a speech about "the echoes of liberty resounding from the peaks of the Andes to the banks of Burrampooter."

June 28.—Going to the War Office, I met the Duke of Wellington at the head of a detachment of his regiment, marching from a Review in the Palace Garden. All these shows are got up evidently to remind King and people of the advantage of a standing army, and of the hero of Waterloo.

At twelve I went to the Military Asylum at Chelsea, and there was the Duke of Wellington again, and a host of officers in attendance to show the children to their Majesties. Many of the soldiers expressed their pleasure at seeing me there, saying they hoped I would not permit the establishment to be put down.

1832.

After seeing the children dine, we went over to Chelsea Hospital. The Duke of Wellington was hissed by the way, and their Majesties were not over and above well received. Lord John Russell, President of the Commissioners, Lord Goderich and Lord Melbourne, also Commissioners, were present; these civilians with myself were the only persons not in gorgeous apparel, and we looked very small on that account. Indeed, the whole ceremonies of this hot, tiresome day seemed contrived to contrast military pomp with civil insignificance; and also to prevent any of us Reformers from innovating upon these favourite establishments.

From the Hospital we went to Sir Willoughby Gordon's neighbouring villa, on the banks of the Thames; and there walked about at what is called a breakfast: the dullest of all our dull English amusements. Obligated to keep our hats off in a hot sun whenever we came across King, Queen, or Princess.

Sir W. Gordon told me that he had not asked any of the Royal Family until the day before, when he was ordered by the King to invite all, except the Duke of Sussex.

June 29.—At House of Commons. Tithes, Irish Reform or Scotch Reform, I forget which, but all now comes, of course. Even Reform ceases to be a subject of anxiety: the Lords having given way, the interest is gone.

1832. FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

July 3.—Joseph Hume brought on a motion relative to Somerville, a private of the Scots Greys, who was flogged for refusing to mount an unruly horse. The partisans of Somerville alleged that his real offence was that he corresponded with a newspaper called the *Weekly Dispatch* and discussed the political duties of soldiers.

Hume said he had taken up the case to prevent O'Connell taking it up in a more hostile spirit. He agreed the less said about it the better, and he added that if I got the man his discharge, he would say as little as possible on the subject. I did procure a conditional discharge, and was never more surprised than when Hume got up and made a bitter speech against me. I was in no little embarrassment, for as I told the Ministers I could not and would not defend the punishment. I was pledged against flogging; the Cabinet were not; therefore the best thing was for me to resign. Althorp insisted that I was not to be sacrificed, and proposed that an inquiry should be made which should be laid before the King. If he said "No," the Government should resign; but eventually Hume withdrew his motion.

FROM DIARY.

July 5.—Lord Althorp says the King instantly consented to the inquiry on the Somerville case. I then went to Lord Hill, and had a smart dis-

cussion with him. I foresee that the two sides of the archway at the Horse Guards will be in acknowledged hostility, and either my Lord or I must go out, that is clear. Indeed, I think it is useless to disguise the fact even from my opponents. Lord Hill must be a poor creature to maintain himself in a lucrative post in opposition to the known wishes of a Cabinet whom he does not support, and nothing but the hope of seeing the office in proper hands could induce me to remain a moment where I am. But it would be unwise to attempt anything at this moment. 1832.

July 8.—The *Examiner* calls Lord Althorp and me “infamous,” for our conduct on Somerville’s case. Such are these gentlemen of the Press! My brother called on A. Fonblanque, the editor, who said he used “infamous” in its etymological sense of “injurious to fame.” When my brother asked him how he could allow the letter of Junius Redivivus to charge me with personal corruption, he said that *he had not looked over the letter accurately. He never saw it until late on Saturday night, and did not perceive the paragraph alluded to.* Are such men fit dispensers of daily fame?

July 11.—Went to the great Reform Festival at the Guildhall. Saw and heard the freedom of the City presented to Lord Grey and Lord Althorp.

The Duke of Sussex, Lord Grey, Lord Althorp, and the Peers were at the top table; the others

1832. were arranged alphabetically. I was a great way off, next to Sir James Graham. Stanley was still lower down; he looked a little sulky, I thought. The enthusiasm, if there was much, scarcely reached us. All made Conservative speeches, especially Brougham, who parodied "the Bill, the whole Bill, etc.," into "the Law, the whole Law, and nothing but the Law."

More than one person remarked to me that, if justice were done, Burdett and myself should not have been lost in the crowd when Reform was the triumph of the day; but Burdett did not come, and I received notice from the Lord Mayor that our healths were about to be drunk, just as the Duke of Sussex rose, and the upper table moved away, so I rose, and what became of the toast I never inquired nor heard. If fame be an object, there is no fear that the truth will be acknowledged, and Burdett at least have his due.

July 12.—At House of Commons, where sat up till 5 a.m. on Russo-Belgian loan debate. Our friends had the best of the debate throughout this time. Peel was very bitter, but only bitter. He made no figure at all.

Our 46 majority did not satisfy Lord Althorp; indeed, he said to me that "the Government was like a hard-pushed fox running fast, but which might be run in upon at any moment." However, I thought our majority quite enough.

Althorp announced that, if Ministers were beaten, they should resign. Peel remarked on



*Sir Francis Burdett
from a picture in the possession of
Lady Dorchester*

this, "No wonder, considering the state of the country." A pretty fellow! What was the state of the country when he left office? 1832.

July 17.—Another debate on Russian loan. The Opposition made very angry by Joe Hume declaring he would vote black white, rather than assist the Tories in turning out the Ministers.

July 20.—A last struggle on Russian loan. We had 191 to 112, an increasing majority, which called forth a cheer from our friends.

July 30.—Mr. Speaker took leave of the Chair and the House. I did not hear his speech, but I heard some of the compliments.

The Speaker was somewhat moved; a good many that moved had complained of his *partiality* in latter times, indeed he could be partial at a pinch. However, he is a gentleman, and we shall not like his successor so well, let him be who he will.

I spoke to him afterwards, and he told me to my surprise that he did not consider his adieu as definitive. He had two or three communications with Lord Grey; and not being certain of his return to the new Parliament, had thought it right to take leave; but the House might chose him again.

August 2.—Very difficult to keep together a House. Wearisome work battling between Stanley and Irish Members. Stanley announces a new *Irish Impartial Justice Bill*, when it is almost impossible to carry through the ordinary business of Parliament.

August 9.—I presented the Report and evidence taken before the Court of Inquiry on the case of Somerville. The Court of Inquiry appear to me to have acted fairly enough. Their report and the King's pleasure quite sufficient censure on Windham. The latter was much stronger as drawn up by Grant, and assented to by Lord Hill; but Lord Althorp struck out the words "severe censure." I presented these papers at House of Commons this night at two o'clock in the morning.

This evening Stanley told me he was going to Ireland, and would get the Secretary's house in the Phoenix Park ready for me. I laughed; but he said, "Upon my honour, I am in earnest"; and he then spoke about my succeeding him as a settled scheme.

August 15.—I saw Lord Frederick FitzClarence, who told me matters were going on well at Court. They had been very uncomfortable; but now were going on quiet, and the King in good humour. He owned he and his family were under the greatest obligations to the Queen, but that she ought not to have been a politician.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

August 16.—Parliament was prorogued; and Lord Althorp, Lord John Russell, and myself were the only occupants of the Treasury bench who attended the Speaker and some eighty Members to the House of Lords.

There were not many Peers present; and only a few ladies—none of any distinction, either for rank or beauty. Lord Grey bore the sword of State, and was the most appropriate personage in the ceremony. Lord Chancellor Brougham also made a suitable part of the show; but I thought, when he put the speech into the King's hand, he bowed with Persian adoration. The Speaker made a good speech, and touched on our Reform Bill without any offensive remark. The King's Speech was, as usual, a poor performance. Reform was mentioned, but without any particular notice. The King was very loud; in some sentences ludicrously so; as, when he addressed the Gentlemen of the House of Commons, he spoke with a sudden roar and emphasis that made me start. The Lord Chancellor prorogued the Parliament until the 16th of October.

I saw the King return to the Palace. It was like a funeral procession: scarcely a hat taken off, and positively no cheering. I never saw anything of the kind like it before. What a difference between his prorogation in April 1831 and this ceremony! I was very sorry, and augured no good from this bad reception of royalty.

•

CHAPTER XIV

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

August.—Wishing to be near London during the long vacation, I rented the long-known residence of Archdeacon Cambridge, in Twickenham Meadows. Whilst there, our friend Admiral Sir William Hotham paid us a visit, and was as agreeable as ever. He told us that he was at an advanced post with Lord Nelson in Corsica; and, as the shots were flying about him, he (Hotham) could not help bobbing. Nelson asked to look through Hotham's telescope, and said, "This is an excellent glass; do you know, I see the French officers bobbing!" Hotham felt the reproach deeply; but presently, when the fire became hotter, he saw Nelson bobbing. He then remonstrated for adverting to that which the bravest man in the world might do inadvertently. Old Lord Duncan used to say, "You may bob with your head, but you maunna bob with your heels."

August 29.—I dined with Lord Palmerston. A gentleman next to me, just come from Russia, told me that the Emperor Nicholas had been much enraged at the strictures on his conduct

in our Parliament. I was not much surprised at this; but I was much surprised when the same gentleman added that "the Emperor was the most liberal man in his own dominions." 1832.

FROM DIARY.

September 8.—I went to Bath with my wife to attend a public dinner given to my brother Henry, who was candidate for the city.

September 14.—Left Bath, which I should not like to live in.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

Monday, October 1.—I had not a single paper undecided on my table at the War Office, and Mr. Sullivan told me that very soon all the arrears would be disposed of. This was well for our Office; but I heard on the following Monday, from Sir James Graham, that the Government had an awful amount of demands for next session. Something must be done in regard to the East Indies, also the West Indies, also the Bank Charter, also the Church questions both in England and Ireland. He told me, moreover, that he did not at all like the Belgian business.

October 10.—I heard that most of the Ministers were in London, and the King at St. James's; and that, in expectation of war between Holland and Belgium, a French fleet was to join our squadron at Portsmouth. I was glad, however, to hear from Lord Chancellor Brougham that there was

1832. no intention of calling upon the old Parliament to reassemble; or, as he phrased it, "to call the old condemned thief into court again."

FROM DIARY.

October 17.—Called at Holland House, and found Lord and Lady Holland looking very ill. She told me she was frightened, and was attended by *seven* physicians.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

October 23.—I dined at 5 o'clock at Holland House. Allen was there, Miss Fox, Lord Althorp, Sir James Graham, Labouchere, Lord and Lady Grey, and Sydney Smith.

Before dinner we went to look at a bed used in hospitals. It floated on water, and Sydney Smith got upon it, and floundered and flounced upon it for some time. "Oh for H.B.!" said Graham. The sight was infinitely ludicrous, and we laughed most heartily at it, and kept up the merriment in the dining-room; but whatever pleasantry there was in the sight, the joke was lost without the man who caused it, as is generally the case with humorists, and more so with Sydney Smith than any man I ever knew. However, the party on this evening were in high spirits, in spite of fears for Ireland, and uncertainties about Dom Pedro and the struggles in Belgium.

There was a good deal of freedom in the talk

concerning our Lord Chancellor, and Lord Grey 1832.
did not spare him. He told us that Brougham would never forgive Hayter, the painter, for representing him looking towards Denman, as if for a hint. But the Cabinet of those days contained one man who did not speak well of any of his colleagues, or of the Court. According to him, Russell was the best of them, next Graham, next Althorp; but the others either unwilling or incapable. One day, at a party which Lord Grey had not left more than five minutes, this colleague of his said, in presence of Lord John Russell, speaking of the Cabinet, "Such a set! such a fourteen round a table!!" Russell said nothing to this exclamation.

During my residence at Cambridge House, Lord Durham lived at Sudbroke Park, and I saw a good deal of him just after his return from St. Petersburg. He spoke very highly of the Emperor Nicholas, and of his minister Nesselrode.

FROM DIARY.

November 2.—Walked over to Sudbroke, and passed the whole morning walking with Lord Durham. He told me the other day Stanley proposed his Church Reform at a Cabinet dinner, and insisted that it should be agreed to and made a final measure like the Reform Bill. Lord Durham protested against the Cabinet pledging itself in such a manner, and it was resolved to postpone the measure until next Cabinet. Ac-

1832. cordingly they met at Lord Holland's, and to Lord Durham's surprise he was the only opponent of the measure. So Stanley is gone to Ireland to prepare his Bills.

Lord Durham said he had often been tempted to resign in consequence of the imbecility of the Government; nothing but his attachment to Lord Grey kept him in office. Yet even Lord Grey did not do well; he liked best those who flattered him most, and was happier with Madame de Lieven and the Duchesse de Dino (Talleyrand's niece) than with plain-spoken politicians.

Lord Durham talking of home politics said that he thought a dispersion of the present Cabinet very probable, but was confident that all would go right after this King's death; even he was getting more sensible. "Le jour viendra," was Lord Durham's motto.

We talked of the formation of the present Government. At the meeting of Lord Grey's friends at Lansdowne House, it was discussed who was to be Lord Chancellor. Lord Lyndhurst? "No." Brougham? "Oh, no, no!" Everybody was against him; and when he was subsequently selected, Lord Holland said, "Then we shall never have another comfortable moment in this room."

Brougham, however, has done pretty well in that respect, except that he once opposed the *Disfranchisement of the Rotten Boroughs*, but was *overpowered*. "And this man's name," said Lord

Durham, "is to be on the Reform Column, and mine, who drew the Bill, not!" "Never mind," said I, "there is History; a book lasts, but a column falls." Lord Durham replied that was his consolation. I added that others who had struggled from beginning to end in this cause would not be named either on columns or by history, but such had been the lot of men at all times, so we moralised. 1832.

Durham dealt his censures pretty impartially on all his colleagues.¹ He says Brougham is an altered man, but he still retains his boundless ambition, and will be trying at everything and dropping everything. His Chancery Bankrupt Court is a complete failure, and in the business of his own court, the arrears are getting as bad as ever.

Stanley he thinks nothing but a debater, an arrogant, narrow-minded man; Graham, an official drudge, a gentleman and a saint, inclined to Stanley. Graham had my place offered to him, but he said he was a county member and could take nothing under a Cabinet place, so Lord Durham proposed he should have the Admiralty. This was arranged in the hurry of the moment; Graham not knowing a man-of-war from a day barge, nor was it necessary he should. My name was mentioned, but the reply was, "What, have a Radical!" etc. And so they went to sober, steady Charles Wynn first, then came Parnell;

¹ He held the office of Lord Privy Seal.

1832. and when one deserted, and the other betrayed, came to the Radical at last.

We talked a good deal about the Elections. Lord Durham expected the returns would be decidedly against the Conservatives, although he was most anxious for the Government to hold together until the new Parliament should be chosen, so I suppose he thinks the contrary not altogether impossible.

He said neither Lord Grey nor Lord Althorp in reality thought of or wished to resign. Even Lord Goderich, who, when the last short inter-regnum took place, left the Cabinet room saying, "Now, thank God, this is the last time I shall put foot here," even he will not give way that Stanley may have his place. As for Brougham, he wants to be Prime Minister, and is doing all to please the King.

I put down all these things from Lord Durham as being true; I do not see why they should not be. I gave him my own opinion very freely, and told him I did not know how I could meet the new House of Commons as Secretary-at-War. He agreed with me, but said I ought to wait and do nothing precipitately. I am not quite sure that he is right; indeed, had I not the hope of doing some good in the office by my new warrant, and seeing all the arrears got rid of, I do not know that I should feel justified in staying any longer in office.

November 13.—I dined with Lord Durham, who

seemed as little pleased as ever. He told me that the "fortunate youth" (Stanley) had managed to lose every election in Ireland. 1832.

November 18.—Three independent electors of Westminster, whose names were unknown to me, called, and asked me to pledge myself to ballot, triennial Parliaments, and abolition of taxes on houses and windows and assessed taxes. I did not hesitate a moment in refusing to give any pledge whatever. I said they were quite right, if they suspected me, to choose somebody else; that I was perfectly indifferent whether I was chosen or not; that if I had not acted in such a way as to beget confidence in fourteen years I never should be able so to do. I did not intend to divide the Reformers; I should soon see how the land lay, and would take measures accordingly; that I should part with the electors on good terms, and look back on our long connection with feelings of pride and satisfaction, without a single regret, and persuaded that the time would come when my view on the subject of pledges would be theirs.

They remarked that my conduct, on that occasion, was very handsome and open, and they hoped theirs had been the same. I replied that it had, they had acted openly and handsomely; but others had not so acted, and that long ago I had information that it had been resolved to oppose me, on some pretext or the other. They replied that the result depended on my answer.

1832. I added that "they had my answer; and that Colonel Evans, or Colonel anybody, would be a better man than myself for any constituency that thought pledges requisite.

One of the party, a young man, said that he had formed quite a romantic opinion of me. I smiled, and said, "There was an end of all romance after this conversation." They laughed and made their bows. Such was Scene 1 of Act I. of my separation from Westminster. I felt that I had done quite right, and never was better satisfied with myself in my life.

Later in the day I had a visit from Sir Francis Burdett, who said he had a letter from Colonel Evans, stating that he had consented to become a candidate for Westminster, and was determined to oppose me.

November 19.—E. Ellice called and showed me a most extraordinary correspondence between him and Lord Grey, relative to Lord Durham's conduct since his return.

Lord Grey complains that it would be impossible to prevent a rupture between him and Lord Durham. Lord Durham had said Stanley was not the man to conduct Irish affairs. On the other hand, Lord Grey said to Ellice that Stanley *must be Secretary of State*, and that Lord Durham was much mistaken if he thought he could head a party.

Ellice wrote a very sensible letter to Lord Grey, confessing the faults of Durham's temper, but

telling him that all his views on the great points of discussion last session had turned out to be right, and therefore he was a considerable man and ought not to be neglected, urging on Lord Grey at the same time the necessity of yielding to public opinion. 1832.

I own I thought Ellice's views quite correct, but how Lord Grey should have sent such a letter to Ellice at Paris passes my comprehension. It is impossible things can go on in this way!

November 21.—I had a note from Lord Durham begging me to see him on important business. I went, and he showed me a correspondence respecting the projected Irish Tithe Measure; Stanley's plan in print, and his remarks thereon. Stanley stated that if there had been any objection to his measure, he ought to have been told so before, and altogether took a very high tone indeed.

Lord Durham was undecided whether he ought to resign at once or wait until the Bill came before Parliament. He asked me whether I thought he would be supported by the public if he went out; and wished me to consult Tom Barnes on the matter. I told him my impression was he ought not to resign; and as he insisted on the necessity of knowing how he might be supported, I said I would consult the person in question.

I found Tom Barnes in bed at half-past one, the shutters closed, and there talked to him "in

1832. cloudy tabernacle shrined." The result was he thought nobody knew Lord Durham's merits; nobody would think about him if he went out; that except Lord Grey and Lord Brougham no one had such influence as to interest the public about the Irish Church question, and that the Protestant feeling in England was so strong as to make it very doubtful whether Government would be supported at home in upholding Catholicism in Ireland. It was time enough for Lord Durham to go out when the Bill came in.

How Tom Barnes must laugh in his sleeve at a Cabinet question being referred to the editor of a newspaper! Nevertheless I believe there was no better course to take in order to keep my friend straight.

November 22.—Lord Durham was rather piqued at the result of my interview with Tom Barnes, but agreed that it would be better for him to acquiesce in the decision of the Cabinet. On going away he said: "I shall not let the fellows know my determination sooner than I can help. I will keep them in hot water as long as I can." Amusing man!

Ellice told me to-day that the real origin of Lord Durham's dissatisfaction with Lord Grey was the refusal of an Earldom at the Coronation.¹

November 28.—Lord Althorp told me to-day that Lord Grey has consented to my W.O. re-

* He was created Earl of Durham in 1833.

forms, which are to be finally determined on by 1832.
Palmerston.

December 3.—Parliament dissolved this day.

December 6.—I dined at East Sheen with Lord Grey: a small family party. The talk chiefly about novels. He is an amiable man with an amiable family, but I cannot discover his capacity, except, to be sure, as a talker in Parliament.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

On Saturday, December 8, came on the nomination for the representation of Westminster, at the usual hustings before St. Paul's Church in Covent Garden.

A considerable crowd of friends accompanied Sir Francis and myself. Mr. Hughes, the American Minister, and a son of Casimir Perier were amongst them. We were at first well received, but hissing and hooting soon began; and placards were exhibited, containing caricatures, one of which represented the Secretary-at-War flogging Somerville!! and extracting thirty shillings from his pocket. One man immediately in front dangled a cat-o'-nine-tails at me. Our foreign friends had full opportunity of witnessing the humours of an English contested election.

My opponent made up for previous civility by making a very malignant attack on me, charging me with all sorts of delinquencies, of which he must have known I was not guilty; and particularly dwelling on flogging, and my bringing

1832. in the Mutiny Bill to perpetuate that cruel punishment. He spoke from notes, and spoke for a hour. I bore it all as well as I could, and then stepped forward to speak; but the crowd began yelling and flinging mud. Some of this strayed and lighted on the American Minister, who was not at all pleased, and said he had seen nothing like it in America. On my remarking that the mud was not dangerous, he said it was not mud, it was *merde*, which it was not.

Wednesday, December 12.—Sir Francis and myself went to Covent Garden, and heard the High Bailiff declare the state of the poll at the close: B., 3247; H., 3214; E., 1096. So Burdett and I were declared duly elected. “*Gratæ vices.*”

To compensate for this Westminster triumph, I soon heard the very disagreeable news that my brother Henry was beaten at Bath, and my half-brother Thomas Benjamin beaten at Aylesbury. It was something of a set-off against these disasters that my late opponent, Colonel Evans, had been beaten at Rye, after his defeat at Westminster.

FROM DIARY.

December 21.—I foresee the impossibility of holding office, Westminster, and character together. I may add, *conscience*, for Westminster may require more than I ought to grant, even were I not in office.

December 23.—I met Lord Sidmouth to-day,

looking as fresh as if he had never drunk a glass 1832
of wine, he being seventy-seven.

December 30.—I had a hint from Lord John Russell that the army was not to be reduced.

I saw Lord Althorp on the subject, and told him unless there was to be some reduction of the army I could not remain at the War Office. He agreed with me; but said that my resigning would go far to break up the Government. I remarked that I would do this in a way the least injurious to the Cabinet, and that it would be easy to find another Secretary-at-War. Lord Althorp then asked me how I would like Ireland. I replied, "Better." He then said that he wished me to write a very strong letter to him, which, if it met with his own views, he would stand by as well as myself.

January 1, 1833.—My servants had a dance; 1833
all seemed very happy, so should I be if my wife's cough would get well. The babies are in excellent health, and most things prosper with me; but then this frightful disease.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

I employed the first days of this year in writing my letter to Lord Althorp, and preparing a scheme for reducing the land forces. Although nominally the reduction amounted to 4,667 men, it did not exceed 927 actual effectives. Lord Althorp consented to back this proposal, and, if resisted, to adopt whatever course I might think

1833. fit to follow. I begged him not to quit office for a few thousand men more or less on their military establishment, and thereby break up a good Administration. Lord Althorp persisted, saying, "An Administration is only good when it does good things."

FROM DIARY.

January 7.—Lord Althorp read to me some notes made by Lord Grey on my letter, the sum of which was, that he was responsible for the safety of the country, that he thought the force wanted, that he hoped the House of Commons would not ask anything that was not reasonable, and finally that my retiring from office would be "fatal."

The next day I went with Lord Althorp to Lord Grey. As we were walking, Lord Althorp told me that he would resign if I did. He would not face the House of Commons if I went out. Parnell and myself leaving the War Office, one after the other, would be fatal; for, although Parnell was an extravagant Reformer, it was now notorious that I was a moderate man. He said that Lord Grey was stiff against reduction of force.

Lord Grey received us with a long face, having half a dozen red boxes under his arm, filled, as he said, with disastrous news from Ireland, and from Huddersfield, requiring more troops.

He then talked of my proposed reductions, and

1833

said he had no objection to taking away troops from the Colonies; but those taken must be sent to Ireland. He read to me a letter from Lord Anglesey, stating that he should want three or four additional regiments, if not more. I had nothing to say to this; but asked what was to be done if we were beaten on the Estimates. Lord Grey said, "Go out"; and he then talked of his "responsibilities for the safety of the country, and how likely it was that some collision would take place between the soldiers and the people; and if the people got the better of the soldiers once, there would be an end of everything."

Lord Grey did not think I could diminish the Pension Warrant to the scale fixed by me. He pitied the soldier, and, in short, convinced me that I had another Lord Hill, or worse, to deal with.

As to my other reforms respecting defining and raising the character of the Secretary-at-War, and making the transfers which I proposed in my last letter to the Treasury, he approved; but the first plan was to be submitted to Lord Hill!!! That is, to the person who is to have his power and authority curtailed by my plan. I said I had no objection to have the scheme submitted to Lord Hill; but if he was to have a veto my whole labour would be lost. It was agreed that I should draw up reasons for framing a new Minute of Council respecting the Secretary-at-War.

I took leave of the First Lord and his Chancellor of the Exchequer "*re infecta.*" Thus ended

1833. this interview by which my masters, no doubt, think they have accomplished their object of inducing me to remain in office without any material reform or retrenchment, if any at all. But I will do no such thing; if I cannot carry my reductions, I will attempt the other alternative proposed in my letter: reform of my office. If I fail there, I will resign, and I shall fail and I shall resign.

Some of my constituents called on me to ask me what course Ministers intended to take about the House and Window Tax, and hinted that I ought to threaten to resign if the tax were not repealed. I said I was not chosen M.P. for Westminster solely to take off the House and Window Tax. We had another warm debate, which convinces me that I cannot long be M.P. for Westminster and in the War Office.

In short, I am beset with difficulties every way. What sort of speech am I to make on Monday? I cannot and will not say what I do not think; and if I am perfectly sincere and tell all I feel, much mischief may be done.

Lord Althorp owned to me that Stanley had done harm by his declarations as to ballot, but more by the mode and manner of making them than by the substance, which was nothing more than he, Althorp, said, namely, *that so far as the present Government were concerned*, the Reform Bill was a final measure.

January 12.—I had a note from Lord Althorp,

requesting me to go to him before four o'clock, on 1833.
urgent business. I went, and he told me that the army was to be increased by an additional five thousand rank and file; and that the increase would be wanted, and justified, in consequence of a great measure which had been resolved upon by the Cabinet. This was neither more nor less than the entire Emancipation of the Slaves, at a period to be fixed either for January 1835 or January 1837, probably the former. I stared, and smiled, as well I might.

He added that he thought the Emancipation would be more popular than the Reform Bill. I did not agree with an augmentation, and said I could find 5,000 men amongst the veterans. Lord Althorp then changed the subject and asked me if I could go to Ireland at once. I replied that I was not aware of anything to prevent me; but that one office was pretty much like another—it was being “between the devil and the deep sea,” although, of the two, perhaps Ireland was the least detestable.

I said my real wish was to withdraw altogether; but I did not see how I could do so, unless required to do something palpably wrong. Lord Althorp told me that I must not leave them on any account, and added that, when he had told Lord Grey he would not face the House if I left the War Office on account of the amount of the Estimates, Lord Grey replied, “By G—d ! nor will I.”

1833. I went away to the War Office, and prepared a scheme for a transfer of troops to the West Indies, without augmentation of the army. I then went to Downing Street and made my statement, which was agreed to, so that I had a right to conclude there was to be no augmentation of force.

I dined with a party at Baillie's, and had a long conversation with Bickersteth. I think even he is not satisfied with an M.P. for Westminster belonging to the present Administration. He most particularly dislikes Brougham, who he tells me gives general dissatisfaction in his court, and never finishes anything that he begins. We both agreed that his fame could not rest on the versatility of his powers.

January 14.—A Westminster dinner, but it did not resemble our old Westminster dinners in the least. Thomas Duncombe, our Chairman, contrived to be very violent against the finality of the Reform Bill; on which, when it came to my turn, I only said that a good authority had told us there was no such thing as "man and for ever," but that I hoped the country would give the Ministers and their measure a fair trial.

January 16.—I sent Lord Grey a short memorandum on the duties and power of the Secretary-at-War, and also a draft of a Minute of Council, which I proposed to substitute for that of 29th of May, 1822, which sanctions the intolerable interference of the military authorities.

1833.

Dined at home and went in the evening to a public meeting of the parishioners of St. James's, convened to consider the Repeal of House and Window Tax. Very disagreeable. I spoke my mind very openly, that if they persevered in pressing the Government to repeal taxes, they would embarrass them in every possible way. I warned them that, as belonging to that Government, I must stand by them, and recommended them to give me instructions what they wished me to do.

I foresee a storm in Westminster, and I trust shall weather it without losing character or sacrificing my own conscience, though I do not know how.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

January 18.—I met a very remarkable man at the Lord Chancellor's dinner-table. This was Nahmek Pasha, the Turkish Ambassador. He had nothing to distinguish him from us, except that he wore the plain red cap, which he occasionally removed, and discovered a head of black hair. On his left breast was a diamond crescent, a present from the Sultan, and he had a gold chain round his neck. He was rather good-looking, with arched black eyebrows, and an aquiline nose. His manners were easy and polite, with very little, if any, of the gravity of a Turk. He handed down pretty Miss Spalding to dinner (Lady Brougham's daughter) with the air of a

1833. Frenchman. He drank wine like the rest of us. He spoke French, not very well, but quite enough for conversation.

I thought, whilst sitting between Lord Chancellor Brougham and Lord Chief Justice Denman, I myself being Secretary-at-War, the Reform Bill being now the law of the land, and other wonders now in full play, that the sight of the reformed Turk opposite to me was more strange than all.

He conversed on all the usual topics, the operas and plays, our climate, etc., with Miss Spalding ; and, when she was gone, answered all Brougham's questions about Constantinople and the Sultan very pleasantly and readily. He gave us an account of the present Grand Vizier, and told us that His Highness had been the slave of another great officer of state, who now treated him with the utmost deference. He mentioned several other grandees of the Court, and generally added whose slaves they had originally been. He mentioned the word without the least repugnance.

He spoke of the present Grand Vizier as being very "vif," when manœuvring his troops in sham battles ; so lively, indeed, that he made them fire bullets and charge bayonets, and kill one another ; although, in private life, he was a mild man.

The Sultan, he said, was a great man, and a very handsome man, forty-six years of age. Of his two sons, the younger, only six years of age, was a prodigy. He gave us an account

of his taking leave of this child. The boy asked him where he was going. "To England." "Do you go by Persia?" "No, nearer to Egypt." "Oh," said the child, "there are revolutions there." The boy called the Sultan "the great Lion," his brother "the middle Lion," and himself "the little Lion." "And what am I?" asked Nahmek Pasha. "Oh, you are the Fox!" replied the boy. 1833.

Lord Brougham asked Nahmek about the Turkish laws. He said they were very good in themselves, but badly executed. He mentioned several punishments in use, but not sanctioned by law. Brougham asked him how they punished theft. The Pasha said the law awarded the loss of the left hand for the first offence, of the right hand for the second, and of the head for the third; but often they began by the head!!

When the party broke up, I took the liberty of talking with the Pasha alone. He said: "Ah, you are a great nation, superior to any I have seen. What is experiment elsewhere, is stability here. They are beginning in France; but you have been long superior to all. Your villages look as handsome as the streets of some metropolitan cities." I remarked that we had just accomplished a great Reform; but we did not think we had arrived at perfection. "Another proof," said the Pasha, "of your wisdom." I complimented him on their improvements in Turkey. "Oh," said he, "we do something, some

1833. little matter in our way; mais que voulez-vous ? ”

Miss Spalding told us afterwards that she had some conversation with the Pasha, and said to him that the Turks ought to have a Parliament. “Yes,” he replied, “in three hundred years.” “Well, well,” said she, “at least you want a revolution in regard to your women. You want a great change there.” The Pasha laughed, and said, “With all my heart; oh, yes! you may reckon on me for that.” Miss Spalding asked who his mother was. He said, “A Georgian.” “Did she never try to make a bit of a Christian of you?” asked Miss Spalding. “Comment pouvait-elle le faire? elle n’avait que cinq ans quand elle était enlevée de sa patrie.” His Excellency answered all this pretty impertinence, from a very pretty mouth, with the utmost good-humour.

January 19.—I went to Lord Althorp, and heard from him that his efforts to second my military reductions had placed him in direct opposition with the authorities at the Horse Guards. Althorp said he was nothing in the Cabinet; he had neither great talent, nor ill-temper, so nobody cared for him. He read Lord Grey’s objections to my proposed Minute of Council. I consented to make any alteration of detail which did not compromise the principle of non-interference of military authorities with the civil department of the Secretary-at-War.

Before I left Downing Street, Lord Althorp said it was very, very likely that I should have the Irish Secretaryship offered to me. I remarked that of the two offices the Irish was the less detestable; but I wished not to leave the War Office until I had got my Pension Warrant signed by the King, and had prepared my official reforms. 1833.

January 21.—I dined at the Asiatic Society Club, and sat next to Sir John Malcolm, who amused me with an account of his visit to Mehemet Ali, at Alexandria, in 1831. There was then a mail-coach running between Alexandria and Grand Cairo. The regiments had bands of fifty Arabs, headed by a Frank; and these played “God save the King” and “Rule Britannia,” at Malcolm’s first reception by the Pasha. Sir John asked them to play “Vive Henri Quatre,” which, in those days, was the French national air. Mehemet Ali talked of the Turks with great contempt. He had two enormous ships-of-war, and told Sir John that his brother Sir Pulteney had advised him not to build ships so large. “But,” said the Pasha, “though the Admiral was right so far as real usefulness goes, yet I am right in order to impose upon those stupid Turks, who are frightened at anything big.”

January 22.—The next day I saw for the first time and was introduced to Count Pozzo di Borgo, another person who figured much in his time. I was dining with the Miss Berrys; the

1833. party consisted of the Lord Chancellor, Macaulay, Lady Charlotte Lindsay, and Lady Carlisle.

The Count spoke English easily and fluently, and was not the least diplomatic in his manner. He said, "Everything promised well for the peace of Europe. His Emperor was convinced of the expediency of preserving it."

The same evening Macaulay took me aside, and talked very seriously of the difficulty of his own position. He was, he felt, placed in a different position from others; for he was liable to be taunted with sacrificing his opinions for money. I told him that the charge would be made against all of us, as well as himself, and with equal injustice; and that it was our duty to do nothing until Parliament met, and Ministers told us what they were going to do.

FROM DIARY.

January 25.—At War Office: Stewart of the Treasury with me. He seems to understand the difficulty of my position, and he told me that everybody to whom he had spoken on the subject understood it also, and knew that I stayed in office only from patriotic motives. This is saying a good deal, but I hope it is true. The great object in keeping up our forces was to make the Whigs unpopular with the country: and to give the Duke of Wellington a large army to fall back upon when he returned to office.

Stewart said if I carried my reforms the Secre-

tary-at-War would be a great state officer, and so he ought to be. At present, he is nobody. 1833.

January 26.—Lord Dover is corresponding with Lord Hill and me, begging us to silence or muffle the clock at the Horse Guards, which strikes so loud as to alarm him, his nerves being shattered by a fever. He is afraid of coming back to Whitehall. This comes, as Fitzroy Somerset said to me, of being cradled in luxury; as if the clock could be stopped for him!

January 26.—I dined at the Mansion House with Lord Mayor Laurie, to meet Ministers. I sat between Vice-Chancellor Shadwell and Horne, Attorney-General; the latter a strange man. He told me Brougham had behaved to him like an insane man; would not let him know that he was to be Attorney-General, although the delay might have lost Marylebone for him, and did in fact cost him £1,000 and more. He also said that one of his placards was, *Horne, the friend of the People*. Two Irishmen who saw it said, "By Jasus, a pretty friend the people have got at last."

January 27.—The awful Session at hand. I dined at Lord John Russell's. Mr. Hallam was of the party, Prince Lieven, Lord Melbourne, Count Pozzo di Borgo, Sir James Graham, besides Lady Hardy and her two daughters.

Lord Melbourne spluttered, spoke loud, and swilled wine, as usual, very jovially. Graham in chastened good temper, behaved as he some-

1833. times does, like a man raised beyond his natural level: the pump is dry now and then.

The Count was the most agreeable of the party; and he told us, amongst other curious stories, that he had seen a letter addressed by Napoleon, when Brigadier at Toulon, to a man who had refused to allow his two daughters to marry Bernadotte and Joseph Buonaparte. He consented to one of the marriages, but not to the other, saying, "It is enough to have one adventurer in a family." Napoleon was angry, and wrote to the father of the girls: "You are a fool; give both your daughters. You think I am nothing. It is true I am nothing now; but I shall astonish the world." Madame Bernadotte had shown that letter to Pozzo di Borgo.

Graham talked in a most melancholy style of *convulsions*, and God knows what; but he was as neat and amiable as ever.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

January 29.—Parliament met. On entering the House of Commons I must say that I thought the appearance of the Members was very creditable to the first Reformed Parliament. The Ministerial benches were very full, and, as was customary, the Members for the City of London sat on the Treasury Bench. The Conservatives, as they were now called, sat on the Opposition front bench—Peel, Chandos, Goulburn, Lord Mahon.

1833.

Hume, by a trick, got possession of the House, and in a long, rambling, slipslop speech, proposed Littleton, saying at the same time that he was not exactly the man fit to be the Speaker. O'Connell seconded Littleton. Lord Morpeth and Burdett then proposed Manners Sutton. We divided 241 to 31 against Littleton. There was no division against Sutton, although there was some debate. I was sitting next to Cobbett, who was joking out loud to himself, and making running comments on the speeches. When the law was stated as to the Speaker's continuance in office, he called out, "Then he is like the King, and never dies."

Sutton was handed to the Chair by Lord Morpeth and Sir Francis Burdett, and he thanked the House in handsome terms; and thus ended Joseph Hume's first attempt to head and lead a party.

FROM DIARY.

January 30.—Ellice told me that an interview had taken place between Lord Grey and Lord Durham. Lord Durham accused Lord Grey of wishing to get rid of him; and so they went on. Ellice said he thought the best thing Lord Durham could do was to resign on plea of ill-health. Lord Duncannon took a different view of the matter, however, and thought Lord Durham ought not to go out.

January 31.—Lord Durham has written the

1833. handsomest possible letter to Lord Grey, begging that all differences might be forgotten, promising cordial support in Cabinet, and begging a fortnight's absence to recover his health. In short, a very conciliatory epistle, with which Lord Grey was much pleased. Now Lord Durham stands pledged to support Stanley's Irish measures. Thus ends this squabble.

This evening I went to Lord Holland's. Brougham, and Melbourne, and Lady Carlisle were there. We talked about Lord Mulgrave's dissolution of the Jamaica Assembly, and Brougham read Mulgrave's speech aloud. We agreed it was a very good speech for the purpose; but Lord Melbourne rose, and, as he was going away, said, "By G—d! you are ruining your empire." "Yes," said Lady Holland, "and there is the chief sinner," pointing to Brougham.

Poor Lady Holland talked to me privately about her health, and said she was very much afraid. I comforted her as well as I could.

February 2.—Got my last note from Lord Hill on Pension Warrant and his final assent to this measure, which, prospectively, is a very great one. I shall get no present fame, perhaps much obloquy, but it is a very important public act, and will save at least one-half of the charge for retired soldiers.

February 4.—This morning came a note from Lord Althorp: "The Irish Government not to be

changed, so all hopes of immediately relieving you are at an end." 1832.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

February 5.—I went to the House of Commons at two o'clock, and attended the Speaker to the House of Lords. The House was crowded with women in feathers, and the Commons were in great force at the Bar. The King was very well received out of doors, and apparently in good spirits. He laid great stress on those sentences of his speech which alluded to Ireland.

The Address in the Commons was moved by Lord Ormelie (the late Marquis of Breadalbane), in a speech which I thought unnecessarily violent. He called Daniel O'Connell "a bird of prey." The "Bird of Prey" made one of the most furious speeches I ever heard in any assembly, so furious indeed that Lord John Russell moved to have some of his words taken down. O'Connell very coolly retracted the words; but then went on in the same tone, not of an apologist, but an accuser. He seemed over-excited, and, when Lord Grey was praised during the debate, called out, "No, no! blood, blood!" In short, he was the great Irish agitator, not the Member of the Imperial Parliament.

February 7.—I waited on the King with my Pension Warrant. H.M. was very gracious, and signed it both at the top and bottom, asking

1833. me if there was any harm in his double signature.

I was going away, when he said he could not refrain from telling me how much he approved my conduct—"public, of course," he added—particularly to the justice done to his Hanoverian subjects (the widows' pensions), for which, as King of Hanover, he begged to thank me.

He asked me how old I was; also whether I had ever had the gout. He gave me a prescription for it: six grains of ginger, six of carbonate of soda, to be taken before dinner. H.M. then showed me his wrist, which was a little swelled with rheumatism, and told me he had never been so well in his life as since he had been in his present situation. After several other inquiries I took my leave.

Thus, with infinite trouble, was accomplished the most serious change which had occurred in War Office Warrants since the days of Mr. Windham. Before leaving Sir Herbert Taylor, I had some talk with him about the state of Ireland. He asserted that there was no doubt but that the Repealers were for the separation of the two islands, and had calculated seriously on the rank they might occupy in the scale of independent nations. They were to be number thirteen, Sir Herbert told me. I wondered at the modesty of their claims.

The adjourned debate began this evening. Sir Robert Peel spoke most admirably, with good

1833.

feeling, as well as good sense, and great eloquence. He did not approve the foreign policy of Ministers, nor was his opinion of individuals altered; but he stood by the Government in all their domestic arrangements. He owned that in former Parliaments he had acted as a party man, taking advantage of all accidents to defeat antagonists; but he should do so no more. He should support Government in all measures tending to peace and order.

He was much cheered throughout all his speech, particularly when he praised Stanley. Indeed, the old usages of the unreformed House, in this particular, seemed revived. But there did not appear to be anything like a decided Opposition in the House, except the Conservative minority.

The debate was again adjourned, but the next day we divided—428 to 40: a complete defeat, which seemed to stagger the Repealers.

February 11.—Lord Althorp told me the plan to be proposed for Irish Church Reform, and said he expected it would be received with acclamation. Well might he say this! Ten Bishops were to be abolished; Church cess altogether given up; and Church revenues revised and redistributed.

I left Downing Street quite satisfied, and when Macaulay asked me privately about the Irish plan, in the House, I replied, "You may depend upon it, it will do."

1833. *February* 12.—At five o'clock, in the House of Commons, I heard Althorp open his Church of Ireland Reform scheme. He was quite right; it was hailed with acclamation. When he cut down the Bishops, and abolished Church cess, there were thunders of applause, O'Connell and the Irish particularly loud. We were all in great spirits: Poulett Thomson and Macaulay more particularly so. O'Connell expressed his gratitude to Ministers publicly; and Shiel told me privately that the plan was admirable. Leave to bring in the Bill was given about half-past ten o'clock.

This was Reform the second; yet some of our supporters still affected to think—or did really think—that Government did not go on fast enough!! Stanley made an admirable speech, in the course of which he said he felt no anger against any man who had crossed him in the exercise of his conscientious duties; and this he said in a way and with an air that carried with them the conviction that he spoke as he felt. He told me privately that, after eight months' battling, he had gained over the Primate to his plan. He was, and naturally enough, in great spirits.

FROM DIARY.

February 13.—Dined at Literary Fund Club. Lord Mountnorris was in the chair. I knew him some twenty years ago as Lord Valentia, a hand-

some, taking, flourishing person, of a mixed reputation. He is now bent, hairless, and toothless, scarcely recognisable. 1833.

Lytton Bulwer, the novelist, patriot, and M.P., sat next to me. He is not an agreeable man, but seems to have some sense, though with a dash of affectation.

February 14.—Hume is to bring on a motion about abolishing Naval and Military sinecures. I went to Lord Althorp, who was in bad spirits and bad humour, and confessed we were in danger. It was very hard upon me, who had recommended the Governorship of Berwick to be left vacant, to have to defend these grants. But Hume brought on his motion, and things looked so queer that Althorp said the worst speech I could make would be better than silence ; so I rose and turned the debate into a constitutional question, as to whether the King or the House of Commons should distribute great military rewards. I spoke with great effect, and was loudly cheered. We divided 232 to 138—a great escape. Even the minority gave a cheer.

February 15.—I now determined to reduce, on vacancy, several of the Garrison appointments. I made out a list and carried them to Lord Althorp, saying if the reductions did not take place I would resign, and that it was absurd for a Government accomplishing such mighty reforms to split on such wretched trifles.

February 16.—Lord Althorp says that Lord

1833. Grey has consented to my proposed Garrison reductions, and he will speak to the King himself.

I called on Lord Durham with Ellice, and there had a talk on the state of the Government, and the misfortune of Lord Grey not listening to good advice, nor to any that was not given by a flatterer. We all agreed that mischief would ensue; and that as for Lord Grey thinking he would be let off by simply quitting office, it was ridiculous!!

February 21.—I was surprised by a memorandum sent in from the Horse Guards appointing some Major-General to the Lieutenant-Governorship of Berwick, and signed by the King, the very appointment which I had given directions to be left vacant. The paper threw me into a fluster; I considered the step as a premeditated outrage on the part of Lord Hill. Lord Althorp consulted Lord Grey and found he knew of the appointment. This was still more astounding. We both agreed it was a most unaccountable infatuation.

Lord Althorp said that Lord Grey was getting more intractable than ever, he had sworn and was in a towering passion; said his friends would not back him, and made obstacles of trumpery matters. He agreed, however, to suspend the gazetting, which, to be sure, he could not help, for I would not sign it. He sent several letters for Althorp to read to me, all conveying H.M.'s sentiments on passing politics, and on the garrison vote and the two Fitzclarence appointments. I never heard

1833.

such rigmarole, inconclusive nonsense. Not one word said about the House of Commons, but merely a discussion on the abstract right of the King to name to these two places. It made me despair of any good result to find such blindness at headquarters.

I told Lord Althorp it would be better for me to retire. I was a source of nothing but uneasiness to him and the Government. But he said that I gave him strength and enabled him to fight up against Lord Grey.

He told me that Lord Grey was always resolved in the Duke of Wellington's time not to come in, of which there was some talk, without Reform of Parliament, and that Reform was to be a good and not a half measure. This bargain he made with the King when he accepted office. Lord Althorp told me it was but due to Lord Grey to say this, but that it was true Lord Grey had since been too delicate in his intercourse with the King, and acted in perfect ignorance of the House of Commons.

Lord Hill is preparing resistance to my Minute of Council, but Sir W. Gordon has advised him to yield with a good grace, as the arrangement is inevitable. I hope it is so. The turmoil, intrigue, and perpetual discord between the Horse Guards and War Office are incredible. Sir James Kempt, to whom I hinted what was passing, would not believe me. Now, however, the plot thickens, and one of us must give way.

1833. A division took place in the House of Commons on a motion of Whittle Harvey's for directing the Speaker to give correct lists of majority and minority. Lord Althorp, in the morning, had said, that for a wise man like Harvey he thought it the most foolish motion he had ever heard of, and yet 92 Members voted for it and only 142 against it. This disconcerted some of us on the Treasury Bench. Horne said it seemed the House of Commons would vote anything to catch a little popularity, even if it turned the Ministers out. I owned that I did not like the complexion of Parliament, for although in great questions the new Members seemed to feel correctly, yet on small points, and more especially on money matters, no Government would be sure of a majority again.

February 22.—At King's Levee, which was very full. The Swedish Minister told me that their army was not now punished by flogging. He had been Minister of War and had opposed the abolition of striking soldiers, but the result had proved he was wrong, for the Swedish army had gained in discipline since the abolition.

In the House of Commons to-day Sir Henry Hardinge announced to me his determined hostility to my suspension of his tenpenny pension and to my new warrant. This is pleasant! What with Hume, Davies, and Hardinge in Parliament—and Lord Hill, Lord Grey, and the King out of Parliament—I shall have opposition enough; to say

nothing of my own constituents, who may break my head. However, I shall go right onwards, notwithstanding. No one will ever know my difficulties, but all will perceive my inadequacy for an office of great *apparent* power, but no real authority.

February 23.—I went to the King, who received me rather abruptly. He opened the Red Book and desired me to tell him which were sinecures and which were not. I did so, but nearly all were sinecures. He told me the Round Tower of Windsor was in the personal gift of the sovereign, and that the Deputy-Lieutenancy of the Tower was also supposed to be peculiarly the King's. He told me that Lord Thurlow had said to him, "God d—— it, there is nothing to prevent any man in Parliament from making any motion. He may propose to take the crown off the King's head. It would be d—— absurd and d—— stupid, but I know no punishment for it."

The King said he hated sinecures, but he hated false economy. He said he had given the Round Tower of Windsor and the Deputy-Lieutenancy to his two sons, because they were not in the nature of garrison appointments, but peculiarly his own.

I am convinced, unless one of the Fitzclarence appointments is given up, both will be negatived in the House of Commons. It seems to be one of King William's unhappy mistakes, handed down to him perhaps from his immediate predecessors,

1833. that there are certain places exclusively in his personal gift, and nothing can persuade him to the contrary.

Dining at the S.S.B.S., I heard that Lord F. Fitzclarence had given up his place.

February 25.—I received a note from Lord Grey telling me I must not leave out the two appointments, Berwick and Kinsale, in my estimate, without explaining why the omission was made to the King, and calling the saving trumpery. Althorp wrote a note telling me to take my own course. This put me in a fury. I had signed the Estimates leaving out the appointments at the express order of Lord Althorp as settled by the Cabinet, and here comes Lord Grey throwing the whole business on me to squabble about with the King. Nothing could be more unfair, but what could I do, the whole arrangement being made and the Estimates signed!

February 26.—I went to the King and showed him my list of garrison appointments. The first thing he told me was that he had filled up Berwick and Kinsale that morning. I said nothing, and we went over the list of garrisons.

The King then sent for Sir Herbert Taylor, and desired him to state the position of English officers and the justice of upholding them. I said I was not afraid of the reasoning of my Parliamentary opponents but only afraid of their votes, and I expressed my fear that some of the garrison appointments would be negatived. The King

said he was aware of the feeling, and if it became general the Government could not stand; that he thought a change of Government in the present state of affairs the worst thing that could happen. He said he had mixed a great deal with the world and endeavoured to find out facts, and trusted he was as well acquainted with them as could be expected in his position. He had done all he could to economise the public money, but he detested paltry savings. He spoke of Hume as a bad man, and alluded to his objection to the Fitzclarence appointments as unhandsome. 1833.

We had a good deal more talk without my advancing a step as to the appointments, and I went away very civilly but very unsatisfactorily treated.

I stated to Sir Herbert Taylor, as I was leaving, the gross impolicy of filling up the appointments, and when I told him I had the orders of Lord Althorp and the Cabinet not to fill them, he stared and said Lord Grey had not said a word to the King on the subject, and offered to go back and convey my sentiments to H.M. He went to the King, and returned shortly saying I knew H.M.'s inclinations, but I might use my own discretion, either insert the appointments in the Estimates or not. I thought this treatment handsome, and I eventually decided to estimate the sums and put "Vacant" to the appointments.

This evening I laid my Estimates and my

1833. new Warrant on the table of the House of Commons.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

February 27.—The debate in the House on the Irish Coercion Bill had not come on until late. It went on languidly till ten o'clock, when Stanley rose, and made one of the most impressive speeches ever heard in Parliament. His closing invective against O'Connell's late behaviour moved nearly the whole House from the benches; and, when he sat down, cries were heard from all sides for O'Connell to explain. He did make the attempt, and shuffled out a shabby, but impudent, explanation of his "scoundrel" speech, which drew on him volleys of "Ahs" and "Ohs," and every token of disgust and contempt. I never saw a man so completely put down.

March 1.—The debate on the Coercion Bill still going on. I had an opportunity of seeing how completely an Irish Member acted under some sort of compulsion; for Henry Grattan, showing me a petition to the King to dismiss his Ministers, said, "I wish to heaven you would hang or shoot O'Connell, and pass some Algerine Act if you like, but not this Bill." The same gentleman, on the same evening, made the most furious of all the furious speeches made against us and our Irish measures. But those who remember him will recollect that, when on his legs, he seemed

to have lost all self-control, and rather raved than talked. 1833.

Peel gave one of his best speeches for two hours. Except a sneer at Reform it was all handsome and candid, and powerfully in favour of the measure. His eloquence was not quite so good as his argument. He got on the back of a river of blood, and could not pass it for some time. Stanley said to me, "He'll never get over that passage." His conclusion was most powerful. The debate was continued until March 4, when we divided 466 to 89, a decisive majority, but only for the first reading of our Bill.

FROM DIARY.

March 4.—A disturbance in the Guards in consequence of some confusion respecting the suspension of the temporary pension and my new Warrant. The Adjutant-General showed me a police report to that effect.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

March 8.—Hume opposed the order of the day for the second reading of the Irish Coercion Bill. He made a violent, clumsy speech, recommended resistance to the measure, and denied that the wishes and opinions of the People were to be collected in that House. In the course of this debate my friend Henry Warburton was thrown so much off his guard, that he announced a *message* from Mr. Hume, who had left the House.

1833. The shouts of laughter with which this message was received enlivened a dull debate.

The debate closed on March 12, and the majority, curiously enough, amounted to the same numbers as before, 466 to 89.

March 13.—I heard to-day that Lord Durham had resigned the Privy Seal, and was to be made an Earl. His resignation was attributed to ill-health and family afflictions.

March 14.—Ministers received a check in the Commons this evening, for Charles Wynn would not allow them to read their Irish Church Reform Bill a second time, suggesting that it was a Money Bill and must be referred previously to a Committee. I found my masters very much discomfited. Lord Althorp said to me, "Well, master, we have put our foot in it this time"; and Stanley said, "This is a blunder."

FROM DIARY.

March 15.—I went to a meeting about the repeal of House and Window Tax, which I promised to support, and which I must support, let what will come of it. Indeed, I think this will be a good occasion for resigning my odious office. I must vote for *repeal* on the 22nd. I have promised so to do repeatedly, and I do not wish to do otherwise, foolish as it would appear to leave the Government for such a cause; but the real difficulties of my position make this fair pretext such as it is expedient to avail myself of.

Here is the Mutiny Bill, which I have not got ready and which I shall not be able to carry as I wish, to add to my difficulties. I have had a very civil letter from the King, but what can that do for me ? 1833.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

March 23.—I wrote to Lord Hill, stating my intention of abolishing regimental flogging, except in cases of mutiny under arms ; and I transmitted at the same time an excellent letter written to me by Robert Grant on the same subject. I felt that this was bringing our differences to a crisis ; and that, if Lord Hill played his cards well, he would get rid of me—if I was supported by the Cabinet, I should get rid of him. That we could not both of us retain our present positions was quite clear.

March 25.—I went to Lord Althorp and told him Lord Hill would not consent to my proposal about regimental flogging. He was more perplexed than I had ever before seen him. He said, "Ay, I now do believe we are at a deadlock. I can go on no longer."

He then told me that, to all appearance, the Cabinet was on the eve of dissolution. Stanley would not stay at the Irish Office ; Goderich would not move from the Colonial Office. He would not move the West India question if Goderich stayed at the Colonial Office ; and the Government could not go on if Stanley went out.

1833. I asked why all this was to take place, merely because Goderich was not told to move. It seemed that Lord Grey did not like to make this proposal to Goderich—an amiable delicacy, but a weakness where such vast interests were at stake. The fact was that Lord Grey was tired with his official life. Lady Mary Wood told me her father had resolved not to continue at the head of affairs after the next July.

March 26.—I had a letter from Lord Hill refusing to accede to my proposal. I went at once to Lord Althorp, left the letter and Robert Grant's letter with him, and told him to inform Lord Grey I could not present the Mutiny Bill unless the clause proposed by me was inserted in it. Lord Althorp said, "Very well, I will send a box to Lord Grey directly." I returned to the War Office, more tranquil; "certus eundi," as I thought.

March 27.—I prepared for bringing on the Estimates, and for announcing that I was no longer Secretary-at-War. I went to the House, but had not been there five minutes when Graham came in, and, seating himself next to me, said, "Je vous salue, mon ami." I asked him what for. "It is all settled," he said: "no Estimates to-night—no Mutiny Bill—all is right. Stanley and you are where you ought to be."

At House of Commons. Lord Althorp beckoned to me, and we retired behind "Solomon's Porch." He said that Lord Grey had desired him to

apologise to me for not communicating with me himself, and had told him to offer me the Irish Office. "I take it," I said, "if it were only to get rid of that detestable War Office." 1833.

We tried all we could to put off Estimates, but there was a general cry for them, so at half-past eleven o'clock I was obliged to bring on the vote for the number of men, which after some discussion was carried unanimously at one o'clock.

March 28.—I had a long walk in St. James's Park with Stanley, who gave me a sketch of the different official people with whom I should have to deal in Ireland. He spoke unequivocally well of only one man—Blackburn, the Attorney-General. He gave me the character of Plunket, and the Lord-Lieutenant, with very little reserve. The first was timid and wavering; the other a good man, but vain and easily flattered. He told me his rule had been "to hear everything, say nothing, and believe nothing."

Stanley's whole behaviour was most friendly; and nothing that has occurred since those long-passed days has obliterated the grateful remembrance of his assistance.

March 29.—I had an amusing conversation with Lord Durham, who told me that Lord Goderich had struggled violently before quitting his Colonial Department. At last the King was prevailed upon to ask him. When he assented, Lord Grey came in haste to Lord Durham, to get the Privy

1833. Seal at once, for fear of some change of purpose ; and the Seal was crammed into the pocket of Goderich, who complained bitterly to Lord Durham, saying, "Why should Stanley have my place? why not Melbourne's?" He was somewhat mollified when he heard there was a salary attached to it, and he then asked if there was any patronage belonging to it. He had since been asking Lord Grey for several things; but, as Lord Durham said, he ought to have done this before he gave up the seals. I laughed heartily at the story, which I tell as it was told to me.

Edward Ellice came to me, and showed me a letter from Lord Grey, pressing him to take the War Office. I urged him strongly to give an affirmative answer. Ellice was much more fit for this office than I could pretend to be. He knew how to manage men, which I never could do; and I was persuaded that his intercourse with the military authorities would be more smooth than mine had been, or ever could be; and to this must be added his near connection with Lord Grey, and the influence he possessed over that most influential statesman.

April 3.—I went to the King's Levee. I found His Majesty not in the pleasantest of humours, and rather sleepy. However, he recovered his usual good-humour, and began to talk about Ireland. He asked me if I had ever been there. He told me there were two parties there—Re-

pealers and Saints—and he liked the latter as little as the former. 1833.

I told His Majesty that I wished to express my acknowledgments for my new appointment. He said, “Oh, as for that——,” as much as to say, “You owe that to my advisers.” I bowed away as quickly as I could, and learnt from Lord Althorp afterwards that Lord Grey had found the King in a bad temper.

Poor Lord Goderich, when he came out of the closet, after resigning the seals, looked half in tears.

I was re-elected for Westminster without opposition.

April 6.—I removed to the Irish Office in Queen Street. I had endeavoured to do my duty as Secretary-at-War, and had attempted several reforms, which would have been successful had I been seconded by the Government. My Pension Warrant, if not superseded by my successors, would produce a great national saving when it came into operation. All the arrears which encumbered the office when I came into it had been cleared away, and the establishment had been reduced from seventy-three to sixty-two clerks, the number fixed by Sir Henry Hardinge. Considering that it was my first experiment of official life—for I never had held any subordinate office—I was pleased to think that I had not disappointed my friends. I had many tokens of regard from those who served under me, and even the Heads of Departments on the other side of

1833. the archway wrote and said several civil things on my retirement. Lord Hill himself, good man, was very friendly.

I found a great change in the establishment in Queen Street, which consisted of only two clerks and three messengers. Having been so admirably seconded and assisted at the War Office, I felt rather forlorn in my new abode; but Stanley's private secretary promised to help me, and Mr. O'Hanlan, the counsel attached to the office, came to instruct me.

FROM DIARY.

April 12.—My first duty at the I.O. was to correspond with Lord Anglesey about proclaiming Kilkenny and suppressing the Volunteers. He was for doing both at once, but Lord Grey and myself wrote to him to wait for some act of the Volunteers before issuing the proclamation. As for Kilkenny, it must be proclaimed at once.

April 16.—I took my seat at the morning sitting of the House of Commons. The Speaker, shaking hands, said to me, "Out of the frying-pan into the fire."

April 22.—Attwood of Birmingham brought forward his motion on currency as connected with national distress. He was violent and virulent. Lord Althorp answered him admirably, and moved that a change would be inexpedient and dangerous.

April 23.—The debate on currency was re-

sumed. Baring spoke for us, but as usual the last part of his speech contradicted the first, and seemed to countenance paper money. Peel got up and attacked Baring on this, and made a noble defence of his Bill of 1819. The debate and feeling of the House evidently with us, although this motion was announced as being likely to shake if not destroy the Administration. 1833.

April 24.—The debate was closed by M. Attwood in a long speech; we were 331 to 139 in favour of Lord Althorp's amendment. We next had a division on distress of the country, which Attwood tried to tack to Lord Althorp's amendment, but we were still 279 to 155; then came Lord Althorp's amendment. George Sinclair divided the House on this, and we had 304 to 49, and so ended this much dreaded discussion. Peel was much pleased, and said in my hearing, "Worthy of a son of Sir John Sinclair."

April 26.—I was so much knocked up by business at the office, and the long nights in Parliament that I did not attend the House of Commons this evening. I sent to inquire what was going on, and the answer came back, "Malt, malt, malt," Sir W. Ingleby's motion for reduction of half the Malt Tax.

April 27.—Ministers were beaten last night, and were in a minority of 10; and I thought they must surely go out.

I went to Althorp, who laughed and said, "Well,

1833. Hobhouse, this time we have escaped ; we are out now." He seemed quite happy, and told me that he had not been so well for a long time.

Those of our party who had voted against us were not aware of the consequences of their vote, and, when the majority were cheering at the announcement of the numbers, Hume said, "Ah, if you knew what you have done, you would not cheer."

Althorp had received a letter from the King that morning which contained these words: "His Majesty deeply regrets the result of last night's debate. He most anxiously desires that his confidential servants will surmount their embarrassments in the Cabinet of this day."

We had a long talk of who was to come in. Althorp thought Peel, and perhaps some of the present set. He told me in strict confidence that he suspected Brougham intended to be Prime Minister, for that when Lord Grey and others wanted to make him (Althorp) First Lord of the Treasury, Brougham opposed it strongly; hence his plan to get rid of the judicial functions of the Lord Chancellor.

J. Hume has written to Ellice begging Ministers not to resign, assuring him that he and some twenty others of the best supporters of Government had voted against them last night, but not to turn them out. They had nothing to do but withdraw their Estimates, and make smaller ones!!! This is incredible, but true. Lord Grey does not think

resignation necessary, but Althorp persists it is indispensable. 1833.

I went to Brooks's, and found all in an uproar; those who had voted against us in despair, and insisting we ought not to go out. They said that Peel and his friends were of the same opinion; it would be base desertion, etc. We had a great deal of fun, but some of them were serious enough and talked of revolution and such matters. They swore we should not go out. I told them all their swearing would not swear away the resolution for taking off half the Malt Tax, and out we must go.

This day a large party, chiefly Irish Members of Parliament, dined with me; amongst them was Lord Duncannon, who told me something much to the credit of O'Connell. When the Grey Government was formed, he was authorised by Lord Anglesey to assure O'Connell that neither Doherty nor Blackburn should be promoted; yet, soon afterwards, the first of these gentlemen was made Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and the other Attorney-General. O'Connell had never complained of this, nor even told the story; and Lord Duncannon, who would have been injured by it, was sensibly affected by that unexpected delicacy on the part of the great agitator. Indeed, he never abandoned that extraordinary man; nor did O'Connell ever speak in public, nor, so far as I know, in private, unfavourably of Lord Duncannon.

1833. *April 28.*—I went to the Lord Chancellor and asked him whether I was to put off the Irish Grand Jury Committee. He stared and looked red in the face, as if hesitating to tell me. I then said that Lord Althorp had promised to let me know whether men remained in office or not. Brougham said, "Oh, to be sure, we must move some milk-and-water resolution to make the House repent of their Friday's folly; it would be absurd to go out on such a question."

He then said that the breaking up of this Administration would probably bring about a patchwork Government, of which Peel would be a part, and he added this would be a sad thing. I thought his comment was uttered more in the tone of inquiry than of reprobation. My suspicion is that he wants some such condition, and will bring it about.

April 29.—At the House of Commons, I sat next to Lord Althorp, who was fidgety, and actually fretful, which I never before saw him to be in my life. A little after five he rose, and said that he should move an amendment on Sir John Key's motion for repeal of the House and Window duties. The amendment stated that the repeal of half the Malt Tax and the whole of the House and Window duties would occasion a large deficiency in the revenue, which could only be supplied by a property tax, and that a property tax was at that time inexpedient.

1833.

As Peel passed the Treasury Bench, I heard him say to Althorp, "Your resolution will do." I was afterwards told by Althorp that this was a little bit of acting on the part of Sir Robert, for the resolution had been communicated to Peel on Sunday, and he had approved of it. He was not taken by surprise, but I was, and, turning to Lord John Russell, I said, I did not know what to do; I could not vote against the repeal of the House and Window duties. "Can't you?" said Russell; "then stay away; it would be very awkward for you to vote against us, when so many of our friends are about to retract their Friday's vote in order to support us." I said nothing; but, going to Poulett Thomson, told him that I should resign my office.

In the course of the evening I had a letter from Graham and Althorp, saying I ought to keep my office and resign. I told Graham that I was not certain as to resigning my seat; but I certainly would resign my office.

The next morning I consulted my wife, who approved of my resigning office, so I sat down and wrote a letter of resignation to Lord Grey. I received a note from him almost immediately, saying my letter had distressed him greatly, and desiring me to come to him.

I went to Lord Althorp and told him it was impossible, after the conduct of the Westminster electors to me, to retain office, and abandon them. I detailed the circumstances of our long con-

1833. nection, and concluded by saying "that my resignation was irrevocable; I could not retract it." Lord Althorp then said: "Though, as one of the Ministers, I have thought it my duty to dissuade you from leaving office, I must, as your friend, say that I think you are right. Your resignation will be a great blow to us; it will all but knock up the Government." I said, "Pooh! nonsense!" "Ah," rejoined Lord Althorp, "you may say so; but whom shall we put in your place?"

I told Althorp I was in great difficulties about voting. He then reminded me how he and I had abused Baring for voting against his conscience to please his constituents; and he asked me whether I really thought it a good thing for the country that Sir John Key's motion should be carried. I said, "No; I think it a very bad thing." "Well, then," said he, "how can you vote for it?" I said, "I would not vote for it, but would resign my seat." He owned my position "was a very painful one; but he had never thought of it until Monday morning, when he was in bed."

Lord Grey received me very kindly and very mournfully; told me he did not know what they should do if I left office; suggested what had been suggested before, of my resigning only my seat, and seeing the effect of that step. I persevered; said I was very sorry, but I could not help taking the step; that I gave the best

1833.

possible proof of the sincerity of my attachment to him and his colleagues, by resigning my seat as well as my place.

I went to Sir Francis Burdett, and begged him to move a new writ for Westminster the same evening, I having accepted the Chiltern Hundreds. I said I had resigned my office, that was done; and, as for my seat, I could not keep it without voting either against my constituents or against my conscience, so that I had nothing to do but to resign. Seeing he could not alter my determination, Burdett undertook this disagreeable task.

I walked away to De Vear, and told him what I had done. He approved, and we both agreed to bid farewell to Westminster politics, unless indeed the electors should spontaneously call upon me to serve them again.

I went home. Lord Lansdowne called to dissuade me from leaving office; but I looked at the clock, and said that by that time the step was taken.

I thought over the events of this day, and felt sure that in these, the most critical circumstances of my whole life, I had acted as became me; erring, if anything, on the side of too great scrupulosity;—and I felt sure of general, if not of universal, approbation. Indeed, it seemed utterly impossible to impute to me any but the best motives for this double sacrifice.

On Wednesday, May 1, I wrote to Sir Herbert

1833 Taylor, requesting him to convey my duty and regrets to the King, for being compelled to quit H.M.'s service. I had an answer very soon, telling me that the King "deeply lamented the loss of me, at a moment when my talents and energies would have been so advantageously employed in the service of the country." I also received complimentary notes from many distinguished people; and an article in the *Times* called the virtue of the resignations unparalleled. Being quite sure that I had done right, I was pleased that others thought so.

May 2.—Charles Wood called on me, and I had a long talk with him. The purport of his visit was to persuade me to return to office. Lord Grey, at the King's desire, would write such a letter to me as I might publish. He detailed over and over again the difficulties caused by my retirement.

I told him I did not know what would be thought of my return to office, as regards Westminster; but as there was to be a meeting at the Crown and Anchor this evening, perhaps the opinion of the constituency might be collected there.

Some of the papers begin to abuse me, and I hear that many good folks stare and confess they cannot understand what I meant by resigning. The double sacrifice is incomprehensible; I must have some motive. General Gascoyne told me very gravely that of course I had other reasons

than those which I assigned in my advertisement. I replied that I was not in the habit of advertising lies. He laughed at my delicacy towards my constituents, and said he would have seen them d—— before he would have acted as I have done.

At the meeting of Westminster electors resolutions were passed highly complimentary to me, and I was again put in nomination.

May 3.—A meeting took place in Westminster, professedly about House and Window Tax, but in reality to put Evans in nomination for Westminster, and at that meeting my conduct was denounced as an act of the basest duplicity, a desertion of my duty, and a perfidious trick; and a resolution accordingly was passed by acclamation, although the chairman, Mr. Daniel Whittle Harvey, defended me. Indeed, I find even my own friends begin to think I must have some deep-laid plot in contemplation. The Government people contribute to this by expressing their anxiety that I should come back, by not appointing my successor. I hear that people cannot be brought to believe in the reality of my making such a sacrifice for honour and conscience' sake; but it is true, nevertheless.

The abuse of the press more violent. Had I kept both office and seat, and voted against the Repeal, I should have been less attacked.

After some hesitation I agreed to stand again for Westminster, and on May 7 I went to Covent

1833. Garden with Lord Ebrington, Duncombe, Stanley, and other Members of Parliament, together with a large body of friendly electors. But the moment I got into the Market the disturbance began; and it was not without difficulty, not to say danger, that I got within the rails of the church portico. The people were ferocious, and, if they had got me down, I should never have risen again. I saw many of my Committee, "well tried through many a varying year," now ranged with my opponents. Fearon, the American traveller, said that he began to suspect we had given more Reform than the civilisation of the people would bear.

I was proposed in the usual way, but when I stepped forward to speak, I was instantly assailed with the most unsavoury missiles, and a storm of hisses and yells. Finding I could get no hearing, my friends persuaded me to return to the hotel where my committee was sitting.

In the meantime, Evans, and Escott, and Wakley attacked me furiously. The chief charge against me was for not voting for the repeal of the House and Window duties; and Evans affected not to believe that I was really out of office.

May 10.—Colonel Evans was returned M.P. for Westminster, by a majority of 152 ahead of me. It was but poor consolation to be told, as I was, that had the poll been kept open one hour longer, I should have won the election. After all my

toils and sacrifices, it appears that there could not be found 2,000 electors of Westminster to record their opinion in favour of my public character or of my private honour, which was clearly involved in the event of the contest. 1833.

Nevertheless I never felt more self-satisfied in my life—never more certain that I had acted as became me, and in a way which would, finally, be creditable to myself and useful to the public. Even at the time I saw, in the applause of every honourable man, a certain proof of the opinion which would ultimately be formed of me. Pelted by the people, deserted by the electors, abused by the press, and assailed in every way by my antagonists, without office and out of Parliament, I never felt more tranquil in my life than this day, at my own house, with my wife, and three brothers, and my wife's brother, Lord Thomas Hay; and, whilst waiting to hear by how many I had lost the election, I allowed myself the pardonable vanity of reciting a very hackneyed quotation — "*Virtus repulsæ nescia sordidæ,*" etc.

My principal friends, De Veau, and Wylde, and Pouncey, called upon me next day to discuss the expediency of petitioning against the return, which, perhaps, might have been set aside on account of some informality; but I decided against the proposal, and one of my friends went to the hustings, at the declaration of the numbers, and declared that I should not dispute the return.

1833. Even this did not prevent Colonel Evans from having a fling at me; for he said, in his speech of thanks, that he hoped, if ever he proved recreant, he might be treated as I had been. Recreant indeed! When will he give up high office, and £6,000 or £7,000 a year, rather than violate his engagements?

But such was the blind violence of the moment, that even the *John Bull* newspaper confessed that it could not understand why I had been so abused. Returning from a walk on the day of the declaration of the poll, I found my window-shutters closed, and heard that a message had been sent by the police that Colonel Evans's chairing-procession would pay me a visit, and twelve policemen were sent to guard me. Contrasting this with former scenes in Westminster, I could not help bursting into a fit of laughter; but I thought it advisable to send my wife and children to the house of a friend. The triumphant procession did not come to my house; but drew up before that of my chairman, the worthy De Vear. They pelted it a little, but did no mischief.

On May 12 I went to Send Grove, and was joined by my wife and children in a few days. I heard that my door-knocker had not been silent for half an hour since I left London.

May 15.—I had a letter from Sir G. Shee, Under-Secretary of State, hoping I would return to office and find a seat in the summer. I sent back to say that I was not enamoured of martyr-

dom, but one day or other I might wear King's Livery again. Ellice wrote me a letter on the following Friday saying I might be returned for Dover. Perhaps I might have been ; but there was nothing particularly inviting in the proceedings in Parliament at that time. 1833.

CHAPTER XV

FROM DIARY.

1833. *May* 22.—I dined with the Duchess of Kent. There were upwards of thirty at table. Sir James Graham and Lord John Russell were of the party. It was the first time I had seen them since I had quitted office.

I had a good deal of talk with Sir J. Conroy on personal politics and characters of M.P.'s. He told me he once heard Joseph Hume recommend the Duke of Kent to be content with keeping one horse-chaise for the Duchess, at which the Duke laughed very heartily. He asked me if I thought Hume meant mischief. I said, "Decidedly not." He agreed with me.

He told me that H.R.H. had taken a great interest in the Westminster election, and was exceedingly vexed at the result. She was most particularly attentive to me. Indeed, I must say that every one I see endeavours to repair the injustice of my late constituents, so far as praise can repair it. I never met with a warmer reception in my life from every one—friend, acquaintance, and stranger.

May 24.—Went to the Children's Ball at

1833.

St. James's Palace: a very beautiful sight. I had a most gracious reception from all, particularly Tories, and some of my old masters.

This being Derby week, there was little done in Parliament; but I remark two votes—one on Corn Laws and another on House and Window Tax—on which, if I had been in the House, I should have been obliged to go against the Ministers: so how could I have held office? The more I think of the course I pursued, the more I feel sure that I did what was right; nay, more, the only thing that was right.

May 26.—I dined at Lord Sligo's: a pleasant party. I sat next to Lady Clanricarde, and was trying to find out the resemblance between her and Canning. I could not, however. She said one or two agreeable and sensible things, and seemed to have a humorous turn. As a specimen of young Lady Salisbury's good sense, she told me that the Tory Marchioness had said that the Duke of Wellington had no taste about women; though, she added, "I have no right to say so, I am sure."

May 28.—Went to the Queen's Drawing-Room to celebrate the King's birthday. The King looked cold enough, the Queen particularly gracious; all very friendly, save one, who turned on his heel; and who was he? The Duke of Wellington. I hope, for his sake, I made a mistake.

May 31.—I dined with Lady Davy, and met

1833. Lucien Buonaparte, the Prince of Canino. He pressed my hand and said handsome things on being introduced to me.

He looked to me very like his wonderful brother, particularly in the lower part of his face. He was more than polite to me, and, sitting next to me, talked with a frankness that was very pleasing. He said that there was no reason to fear a revolution in England; but he would not answer for France. He added that Napoleon knew France better than any one, and confessed that he and his Republican friends had been wrong. He thought Waterloo had ruined Europe. Had Napoleon been victorious, he would have governed constitutionally and peaceably; at least, he said he would, and Lucien believed him.

Lady Dudley Stuart, Lucien's daughter, was one of the party: a very pleasing woman, but now very plain. Lord Stuart de Rothsay and his wife dined with us; he, as usual, was very agreeable. Lord Kerry and Lord Russell were both there—very young, and made me feel very old.

I afterwards went to an Assembly at Lady Grey's. Lord Grey received me most kindly, as, to be sure, he ought.

June 19.—There are rumours of a change of Ministers and dissolution of Parliament. The friends of Government, as usual, are the chief propagators of these tales; the cause assigned is that the Peers will throw out the Church

Temporalities Bill, and Lord Althorp having 1833.
said the Government would stand or fall by the Bill, he and his colleagues must abide by the assertion and resign.

I had some talk with Chief Justice Denman on the subject, and he seemed to think the embarrassment great. I foretell the Government will scramble through this difficulty.

P. Methuen, who has been here this minute, says that Ellice and Gordon hint that the Ministers have resolved to give way on the point on which they and the Peers are likely to differ, namely, the appropriation of Church revenues (if any surplus) to such purposes as Parliament may approve.

All these reflections were soon lost in the serious attack which threatened the life of my wife. Most unfortunately she had been prevailed upon to try the new quack system, and a certain Doctor Beluomini was the person sent for to carry it into effect. It produced the worst possible effect: a blood-vessel broke in the lungs, and for a short time I thought she was lost; but Dr. Warren assured me that there was still some hope, and, by his assistance and constant attendance, the hemorrhage was stopped.

Lady Julia continued to improve, and was soon so much better that I was able to see some of my friends. I found, however, now that I was altogether out of the concern, that Parliamentary talk was insufferable.

1833. *June 27.*—I was asked to attend a Committee to answer questions respecting the duties of Secretary-at-War. I almost made up my mind not to attend, as I knew the intention was to extract evidence from me against the military authorities at the Horse Guards, and there were no less than four M.P.'s on the Committee who had already been at the head of the War Office.

June 28.—After some consideration I went to the Committee, and all went smoothly till Hume asked me whether the Commander-in-Chief had opposed any of my proposals for reduction. I declined to answer that question, as this would betray the secrets of official intercourse, and the question was afterwards withdrawn.

No man ever made greater efforts than myself to control the power of the military authorities, and, had I been listened to, the Secretary-at-War would have become an independent Minister. But I would not consent to abuse my official experience by making it the foundation of charges against those with whom I had been in confidential intercourse. I would willingly and fearlessly *act* upon the knowledge I gained, when in the office; but I will not tell tales out of school, which would not produce the desired reforms. On the contrary, some of my details might be incorrect, my inferences wrong. Hardinge and others would contradict me; their authority might be thought better than mine, and my disclosures would retard instead of advancing the public cause. Never-

theless I shall, of course, be much abused by the worthy Radicals. "N'importe." 1833.

July 2.—Dined at Paul Methuen's. A House of Commons party, very dull for an ex-M.P.

Burdett again expressed his discontent at my giving up Westminster, so did James Brougham. I said, as the girl did who ran away with the footman, I would do it again if it were to be done again. Burdett said that so far as I was concerned there was nothing to be said, but he had been so long in the habit of considering only the public good, that he never thought of his own character or convenience.

Now this is all very well, but how can the public good be advanced by the ruin of individual reputation? I might have retained my office and my seat and voted with Government, but after so shameless a contrast between my repeated assurances to my constituents, and my after-conduct in Parliament, what weight could I ever have given to any Government, or to any party, or to any cause? I might indeed have retained my seat and opposed Government, and I sometimes think this would have been preferable to throwing open Westminster to an adventurer, and thereby degrading the Metropolitan constituency. But who could have foreseen that, after my double sacrifice, the electors should be so imposed upon as to treat me, not as a martyr to my own notions of scrupulous honour, which I was; but as a traitor to themselves, and a

1833. deserter of my principles? Had I thought such a mistake possible, it is likely I should have hesitated much more than I did before I resigned my seat, for it must be confessed the result of the last contest cannot but be prejudicial to the public interests. There wanted not another example of public ingratitude. It is some comfort, however, that the question seems now to be tolerably well understood. The gallant Colonel is not raised, I am not lowered in public estimation, and the electors of Westminster will probably take the first opportunity of showing that they have recovered from the error of the moment.

July 4.—Dined at David Baillie's; met there Lord Tavistock, with whom I had a good deal of conversation on the state of the Cabinet. He told me Lord John Russell is not pleased with the doings of Government, and once had almost resigned. There must be a change at the close of the Session.

July 6.—I have read a little lately, chiefly lounging books; but I cannot say I take very readily to study after years of public turmoil. The business of office has also given a different turn and tone to my mind. I hope, however, to be able to return to books in good earnest, unless I should return to my old occupation.

July 7.—Dined at H. Stephenson's. Duke and Duchess of Cleveland, Duke of Sussex, etc., there: a pretty Sunday party.

The Duke of Cleveland showed us the letter

of summons to attend the Lords on Tuesday next, 1833. when it is expected Ministers will be hard run on Local Courts Bill. The Duke told me that he expected our friends would be beaten, and he was alarmed at the consequences which might ensue from a change of Administration, or from a collision between the two Houses. He seemed very serious indeed, and he is not at all a timid politician.

July 9.—This evening Ministers beaten by majority of 12 on Local Courts Bill in the Lords. Now for the tug of war.

July 13.—I sat for my bust to Campbell, the sculptor.¹ A tedious operation. He seems a very ignorant man, and I have remarked this of almost every artist I ever knew, Chantrey and Jackson excepted.

July 14.—I dined at Lord Harrington's: a most curious scene. His wife (Miss Foote), a pleasing person, who did the honours well to a most numerous and miscellaneous party.

Lord Harrington, in his usual strange costume, did not appear till just before dinner at half-past eight. Lady Tavistock was the only female present. I sat between Lord Tavistock and Luttrell; the latter amused himself in quizzing the feast, as might be expected. I must say it was very absurd. The servants were dressed in some ancient costume with large sleeves. Count d'Orsay was of the party, and fixed his eyes on

¹ This bust is now at 42, Berkeley Square.

the Countess in a very intelligible manner. A singular bye-road to fame, and yet Lord Harrington must love notoriety; nothing else can account for such troublesome vagaries. He is a pleasing, agreeable, and, in most respects, a very sensible man. We had a weary time of it till half-past ten.

In the drawing-room were one or two more ladies, and Mrs. S. Whitbread amongst them. We had music, *i.e.* a song from the Countess, the Jews' harp performer—a curious exploit—and James Smith with his eternal Sirname song.

I had a long talk with Tavistock on the state of affairs. He seemed persuaded that the present Ministerial arrangement neither could nor ought to last beyond the Session. He was against any measure that would annihilate the power of the House of Peers.

He told me that the plan was for Abercromby to move and Grote second a resolution or address to the King, if the Church Reform Bill were thrown out, expressive of the wish of the Commons for His Majesty to take some steps to prevent a collision between the two Houses, *i.e.* *create Peers*. If the present Ministers are to remain in office, such a step appears inevitable.

July 15.—It appeared very clearly by the Opposition papers this morning that the Peers had given way, so far as the second reading was concerned.

Went to the Zoological Gardens and saw Mr. Sabine, who told me that the year before last the Society had taken £12,000 in shillings, but only £10,000 this year. He said that all the keepers were country folk, sons of gamekeepers, etc.; no menagerie men—they had found them to be rogues. 1833.

July 16.—This day we went to Twickenham to the villa recently inhabited by Sir George Pococke, and now called Orleans House. It was a delightful residence, open and yet retired; not a building was to be seen from our terrace, or from our windows. Our own smooth lawn, the lovely Thames, the avenues of Ham, the meadows of Petersham, the woody slopes of Richmond Hill, seemed to belong to us alone, and made for our enjoyment; and the tranquillity of the retreat, after London, was in itself the charm of charms.

During this season I went into society more than I had been for many years, and had no reason to regret my retirement from public life.

July 17.—I had a letter from E. J. Littleton¹ yesterday, telling me he “likes his office much, and contemplates official deposition with pain.” Now this is just the man for office. He has no reputation to lose, and has what are called habits of business, without any anxiety to excel in Parliament.

¹ Edward John Littleton, Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, created Baron Hatherton 1835.

July 22.—I am employed in looking over newspapers since 1820—a tiresome and not so instructive an employment as I should have thought. I find, however, as far as myself is concerned, that with my present experience I should not have acted always as I have done. Indeed, who would? Yet I have nothing to regret or blame in the general tenor of my conduct, and least of all towards the people of Westminster, to whom I have devoted the best years of my life.

July 27.—Sharp work in the Lords. Government beat on one important clause in Committee, but Lord Grey said it would be folly to go out upon it.

Lord Tavistock came to us to-day. He said if Government were to restore the amended clause, they would be beat; if not, they will carry their Bill. Ellice tells me Lord Grey will not attempt any change, and the Duke of Wellington is sick of opposition and sighs for repose.

July 31.—The Lords passed the second reading of the Irish Church Reform Bill by a large majority, 59. The Duke of Wellington for it.

August 17.—My friend Lord Althorp declared the other day that it was his intention to give up the House Tax the next Session of Parliament. Had he told me this, I should not have had all my troubles, but he did not know it.

August 20.—I have been debating what I shall do with myself during the autumn and winter.

This no employment, after my active life, is an 1833.
annoyance. I do not like to begin any serious
pursuit, but I must, or I shall eat up my own
soul.

August 29.—Parliament prorogued to-day. As
I foretold, Ministers managed to scramble through
the Session.

September 10.—Returned to London. Walked
about the streets and met scarcely a soul. A
most melancholy scene.

I have resolved to return to my Italian work,
and prepared books and journals accordingly. I
hope I shall be able to do something with it,
but I doubt, my hand has been *out* so long.

September 12.—Left London and went to
Basildon Park, to take up our residence there
on a year's trial.

November 7.—I have nothing to record of my
life at Basildon. I have endeavoured to suit
myself to a country life, but I do not think
with much success. Besides the land let with
the mansion, about 40 acres, I have also taken
the Park, 179 acres; because I do not chose to
have the farmer, his sons, and servants walking
under and looking into my kitchen windows. I
have bought 3 cows, 27 pigs, and 192 sheep.
I have put four or five men to work in the
neglected garden, and have taken the spade and
mattock in hand myself. I have retained the
keeper, and declared I shall preserve the game.
I walk to my stable, cowyard, and garden, and

1833. look at my young wheat most days. I go out with a gun in my hand and toil between five and seven hours, and bring home little or nothing. I go to church, and am civil to the neighbours. In short, I do what is usually done, and perhaps might be well contented to continue the experiment if my wife's health permitted me; but Dr. Warren informed me I must remove her, if only for a short time, and accordingly I am going from this place to-morrow to London.

November 14.—I went with my wife to Rendlesham, where my wife's brother, Lord Thomas Hay, was rector of the parish.

November 17.—Heard Hay preach. Like most other preachers he is a good fellow, and we won't talk of his sermon!

November 23.—Returned to London, and got permission from Dr. Warren for my wife to make another trial of Basildon.

December 2.—I met my old acquaintance Macaulay, who, to my surprise, told me that he was going to India as Legislative Member of the Calcutta Council. This, he said, would make a vacancy at Leeds, and he hoped I would think of it.

Macaulay told me that it was all very fine for him to be M.P. for Leeds and Secretary to the Board of Control; but, not having a shilling in the world, he found Parliament was not the place for him, and he was resolved to make money enough to ensure an independence. Six

years in India would satisfy his wants ; he should not, at his return, be more than forty years old, and he might return to public life. 1833.

He then declaimed against Stanley, to whom he allowed the highest capacity in almost every respect, except that of seeing what was beneficial for the country ; and who therefore, even more than W. Pitt, seemed born for the destruction of the aristocracy, by his honest, uncompromising defence of them.

He spoke of Brougham as everybody else speaks of him, saying that when he (Macaulay) came into Parliament, Brougham, because not consulted, turned his back on him. So I see my friend Macaulay is not pleased with his position or his masters.

December 3.—C. Wood wrote to ask me if I would stand for Huddersfield or Leeds. Lord Tavistock, Lord J. Russell, and Ellice hint on the same subject. The truth is it will not do for me who has been chosen seven times for Westminster, without solicitation, to become a canvasser, and I will not.

December 4.—Colonel Jones called ; he is much changed for the better. He told me some anecdotes of the scoundrels who conduct our daily press.

Alderman Harmer, the attorney, who sits on the London bench to punish petty larceny, gets £3,000 or £4,000 a year by being proprietor of the *Weekly Dispatch*, a paper which thrives on the

1833. worst of all crimes: the destruction of private and public character.

December 6.—Ellice having told me as a great secret that the King had granted a Commission to him and Russell, and several others, to inquire into the practicability of consolidating the Civil Departments of the Army under a Board, I wrote to him to tell him another secret, namely, that the said project was a child of my own, left in the cradle when I quitted office, as he would learn from a Memorial drawn up by me.

It is a good joke affecting to forget all the efforts I made to effect this reform!!!

1834. *January 1, 1834.*—Another year. May it prove less disastrous than the last!

January 6.—The consolidation scheme, after a great struggle, is given up. I thought so!

Early in this year George Lamb, my old opponent in Westminster, died. He and I had latterly been on very friendly terms, and I much regretted his loss. Ellice wrote to say that Lord Howick was to succeed him in his office.

I had letters inviting me to stand for Bridgewater, East Somerset, Marylebone, Devizes, and one or two other constituencies. I answered uniformly, "Yes, but on my own terms: no canvassing, no pledges, no promising, no lying."

Being a party to the passing of the Reform Bill as a final measure (so far as we were concerned), I never could support any essential

change of that great measure, and would sooner remain out of Parliament all my life than adopt that sort of politics. 1834.

This doctrine is very likely to keep me out of Parliament, but a man may live and not be an M.P. "*Hoc sine viximus ante*," up to thirty-three years of age. We have Reform, and it is something to have been engaged, and deeply too, in bringing about that great change.

January 17.—Old Mr. Arthur Palmer called, a very fine old gentleman in his eightieth year. He rises at five every morning. He told me of my grandfather, that going to canvass him for some small appointment, he said, "Sir, you are Whig and your father before you. I am blue to the backbone. Say no more; I will not vote for you, and ask me no more questions," at the same time pointing to the door. How am I degenerated!

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

February 4.—Parliament met. The King's Speech of a conservative character, and promised little. The Opposition in the House of Commons was insignificant.

February 20.—The Session has been much taken up with the only serious scrape in which Lord Althorp was ever involved. I allude to his imprudent attack on certain Irish Members, whom he accused of saying one thing in private and another in public.

On the question being put to him by Mr. Sheil,

1834. Lord Althorp very quietly replied, "The honourable gentleman is one of them." A committee was appointed to examine into the general truth of the charge, and Sheil was fully acquitted. Lord Althorp made an apology in the House of Commons; but, being acquainted with the whole transaction and the origin of Lord Althorp's error, I did not think he made so manly an avowal of his mistake as he might have done. But it is a good deal to say of a man, who played so conspicuous a part as Lord Althorp, that he made only one false move in his whole career.

FROM DIARY.

February 24.—Went to the Queen's Drawing-Room. Introduced for the first time to Ada Byron; she is a large, coarse-skinned young woman, but with something of my friend's features, particularly the mouth. I was exceedingly disappointed.

March 8.—Dining with Sir G. Shee, I met Prince Lieven, Count Björnstjerne, Dedel, Bülow, Duke of Richmond, Lord Lansdowne, Lord J. Russell, Littleton, Spring Rice, P. Thomson,¹ Sullivan, Lord Cawdor, and Lord Palmerston; so that, excepting Lord Cawdor, I was the only non-official guest present.

I had a long conversation with Littleton. He

¹ Charles Edward Poulett Thomson was then President of the Board of Trade. He was created Baron Sydenham in 1840, and died in 1841.

1834.

told me he liked the Irish, but owned that he could put little faith in any Catholic, almost all were Jesuits, nor could he find much help in any official man. Plunket was grasping and shabby, rash at first and timid afterwards. He told me he could not have gone on with Lord Anglesey, vain and rash, and taking no counsel. He had a scene with him shortly after coming to Dublin. Of Lord Wellesley he spoke in high terms. He said that, if he had quarrelled with O'Connell at the beginning of the Session, the Estimates would not have been passed yet, but the quarrel would soon come.

In short, I see it is with him as it was with me. He is not master. He was very civil, and said that he was sorry I had not gone to Ireland, I should have just suited the Irish.

Poulett Thomson then had a long talk with me. Said things could not go on much longer; they might get through the Session. He believed Tories would come in before a good Government was formed. He condemned Graham's conduct, and as usual declaimed against the Duke of Richmond. He abused the Cabinet Ministers for making no arrangements during the long holidays, but shooting, etc. He thought Althorp the best of them, but condemned his indecision. Althorp said at the close of the Session that nothing should induce him to meet Parliament again as Chancellor of the Exchequer, yet there he is.

Poulett Thomson agreed with me that, if a

1834. dissolution took place to-morrow, the present Ministry, as Ministers, would not have a majority. I see that he, like Littleton, is also a reluctant labourer, but both of them will grumble and go on.

March 9.—Dined at Lord Holland's. Lord Holland told me that Mr. Fox thought shy men were fond of public speaking. I said, Yes, and begin with Mr. Fox himself. Lord Holland said that was true; Mr. Fox was shy in company until he had got a footing there by a few sentences. Another saying Lord Holland told us: that a silent man was not to be trusted with a secret.

March 13.—I went to Lady Grey's assembly. Lord Grey was, on that day, seventy years of age. I said a few words to him on the occasion. "Yes," said he, "many gone, and few to come." I thought I had more than once remarked of Lord Grey that he had a melancholy turn of mind; but I had not then learnt that this belongs to old age more than to individual despondency.

March 20.—Lord Tavistock has written a letter to me begging to know what I think of the propriety of some of the Cabinet *retiring* to save their character, because they differ from Lord Grey and do not approve of his timidity. He begs me to answer him without showing that he has asked me the question. I did answer him, half in jest, half in earnest, and did not recommend retirement.

Tavistock sent to me John Russell's apology for appointing the Tory Gleig to the chaplaincy of Chelsea. I do not think it wants an apology, but I admire Tavistock's comparing his brother's conduct to mine last year, and saying that it is intelligible only to very pure and refined minds. What does Russell abandon? what self-sacrifice has he made?

March 21.—Had a party at home. Tweeddale, young Russell, Sir M. S. Stewart, Sir E. G. Wilmot, Lord Ormelie and his pretty sister-in-law, and the ever delightful Lady Charlotte Lindsay.¹

Lord Grey presented the Cambridge Petition, in favour of Dissenters. The Duke of Wellington opposed, and said the 39 Articles were part of Christianity or Christian belief. Chancellor of University of Oxford!! "Brave but barbarous theologian, in fact philosopher and obsolete statesman," as the *Times* calls him. I suppose, however, the Lords will be of the Duke's opinion, and a collision will take place, on this as other questions, *e.g.* disfranchisement of corrupt boroughs.

March 22.—Shamefully idle life! Out of joint, can apply to nothing. I try to read, but in vain.

Dined at E. B. Clive's, and had a great deal of talk with young Stanley, Clive, H. Tracy, and Denison. They seem to think friend Ellice is

¹ Daughter of Lord North (Earl of Guilford), married 1800 Lieut.-Col. the Hon. John Lindsay; died 1849.

1834. bidding for the leadership of the House of Commons, and is likely to get it.

March 23.—Dined at W. Ord's. Met my old friends Lady Jane and Lady Fanny Harley. Wofully changed.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

April 18.—I hear great apprehensions are entertained respecting the intended procession of the Trades Unions with their petition to Lord Melbourne in favour of the Dorchester convicts. But the putting down of the attempts at insurrection at Lyons and Paris has tranquillised the alarmists in London. The Government, however, have prepared for a possible commotion, and some light guns have been paraded through Hyde Park to St. John's Wood.

April 21.—The Trades Unions' procession marched from Copenhagen Fields to Whitehall. I saw them; they were in good order, six' abreast, and were about two hours and a half passing Whitehall. They were quite orderly, and did not shout. Dr. Wade, in full canonicals, marched before them, accompanied by Owen, the philanthropist, as some called him. The petition, signed, it was said, by 100,000 names, was carried by five bearers to the doors of the Home Office. Lord Melbourne refused to receive it. The procession moved on over Westminster Bridge, and halted in the open space in front of the new Bedlam. After learning what Melbourne's de-

cision had been, they separated quietly. The police and the soldiers were kept out of sight; so were all the special constables; and the usual sentries at the Horse Guards were withdrawn. Joseph Hume was foolish enough to ride down Parliament Street by the side of the procession, but was not noticed. The numbers that marched in procession were calculated at from 25,000 to 30,000. Some of them were fine-looking fellows, and well-dressed; but the great majority very poorly clad, and meagre-looking. All sorts of absurd rumours were afloat as to these poor people. A near connection of mine told me that 15,000 of them carried stilettoes; I did not believe that 15,000 stilettoes could be found in all England—no, nor in all Europe. 1834.

FROM DIARY.

We kept our servants at home, and I believe most families did the same, but when I went out I could not perceive that the procession had stopped the usual business of the streets. This, however, was the case on the line of march, so I heard.

Notwithstanding this display of physical force has passed off quietly, a repetition of such scenes is not to be tolerated, and I trust something will be done to prevent it. I think some of my Tory friends are half sorry that blood was not spilt; anything that can damage the Government is acceptable to them, and they now affect to pity

1834. the poor Unionists as being deceived by Lord Melbourne; others amongst them assert that a great part of the procession was armed.

April 22.—I called on Lady Holland, and had a conversation with her about my resignation of last April. She told me I was missed every night in Parliament.

I called on Lord Durham, who has returned from Paris. He seemed much pleased with his tour, and talked as if he had really been negotiating some commercial treaty on behalf, not of the English Government, but the English people. He said that when the Duc de Broglie went out, the great anxiety of the French Cabinet was to know who would be most acceptable to England as a successor to the Duke, and that his opinion was eagerly asked. Indeed, to listen to my worthy friend, you would think he was already the power he expects to be in the "kingdom come" of the little Princess.

O'Connell brought on his motion in the House of Commons for Repeal of the Union. Spring Rice, in an admirable speech of six hours, established his reputation. The motion was negatived by 560 to 38.

April 24.—I read, for the first time, Dumont's "Souvenirs sur Mirabeau," the most interesting work I ever read on the subject, and throwing an entirely new light on the events and characters of the early Revolution. The selfishness, trickery, and unscrupulousness of

1834.

almost all the distinguished men of that period are placed beyond doubt, by this authentic and impartial writer. The Girondists cease to be heroes. Some of the anecdotes are most laughable, *e.g.* the attachment of Teutsch, Mirabeau's valet, to his master.

April 27.—Dined with Sir Francis Burdett. I met Stanley and Lord John Russell, and had a few words with the former of these on the Repeal debate. He told me that I ought to have heard the set-down that my friend Bickersteth gave our Lord Chancellor in the argument on behalf of the London University. Brougham asked him what would be the consequence if the University gave degrees without a charter. Bickersteth replied, "The scorn and contempt of mankind." B. was counsel for Cambridge University on this occasion.

May 5.—I went to the Duchess of Kent's: a very large party, all London there. Sir John Campbell said, "I feel for you," alluding to H.B.'s caricature, which to be sure is ludicrously false as to fact, as if he and I were in the same predicament. The other day on debate on Heron's placeman's Bill some one mentioned me amongst those who had lost their seats by accepting office. How is history written! Althorp put the man right.

May 8.—Met the Chancellor. He spoke about my coming into Parliament. He told me Ministers were resolved on passing the Poor Bill

1834. this Session in spite of the *Times*; asked me to come to his wife's assembly that evening, where there was, he said, to be a party "choisi," of which he should not know half a dozen. What can this queer man mean by lying about such a trifle? He reminds me often of what Lady Bolingbroke said of Pope: he will play the politician about cabbages and turnips. I went to the Chancellor's and had a pleasant evening.

May 9.—Edward Ellice dined with us alone; gave me an account of Lord Durham's mission to Paris, and the unbelievable vanity of the man; but it is true they were both very much feasted, and that King, Ministers, and Deputies, all pressed round them to assure them of the good intentions of France towards England.

The Poor Law Bill read a second time and passed by an enormous majority, 300 and odd to 28. The *Times* is furious against the measure, and falls foul of Lord Althorp accordingly.

May 11.—The Lord Chancellor and Lord Advocate of Scotland (Jeffrey) called and read letters from Edinburgh by which it appeared that the electors there, on the expected vacancy by Jeffrey's elevation to the Bench, had resolved to induce me to be candidate for the representation of their city.

Brougham and Abercromby urged me very strongly to come forward, and Jeffrey explained the Church question, which, he said, was all that I should have to be explicit about. But

I still held back, and concluded by saying that I wished to have a few hours to consider of the matter. 1834.

I consulted Lord Tavistock, whom I looked upon as more of a friend than the other advisers, and he was against my going to Edinburgh. I therefore wrote to Jeffrey saying positively, no.

I took a walk with Burdett, who told me that he had opened a negotiation between O'Connell and Lord Grey. O'Connell told Burdett that there was now an opportunity of pacifying Ireland; that if Ministers would but adopt his Tithe Bill, he would answer for quieting the whole country; and following up a hint given him by Burdett, he confessed his own position to be a disagreeable one, and he would not be unwilling to take office under Lord Grey. He would prefer being Attorney-General, in which position he could be of great use to Government by introducing good law reforms. Burdett asked if he could be re-elected. O'Connell answered, "Not for Dublin, but for Kerry, yes." They then talked of his becoming Master of the Rolls; the present Master is an old man, and might make way if raised to the Peerage. This was the substance of this extraordinary conversation.

Burdett went to Lord Grey, who made no difficulty as to himself, but asked how Stanley would or could sit on the same Bench with O'Connell. As to making the present Master of the Rolls a Peer, the King would not hear of it;

1834. and the negotiation accordingly failed. Sir Francis thought it was scarcely possible to pay too high a price for the pacification of Ireland, which, in his opinion, could be obtained only through O'Connell.

Lord Tavistock told me this day that the differences created by Lord John Russell's speech as to the Appropriation Clause of the Irish Church Revenues Bill had been made up. Russell told Tavistock that Graham is the most difficult man to deal with on this point. Graham met Russell's argument by saying, "My position is a difficult one; I am a believer!!!" As if Russell and the Liberals in the Cabinet were not; and as if the Appropriation Clause could be affected one way or the other by his belief. Indeed, some might think the Church stronger by giving up superfluous revenues. This man cannot be a Minister in these times much longer, although an excellent *chef de bureau*.

May 12.—Had a note from the Chancellor insisting on my going to Edinburgh, enclosing letters from John Murray and Gibson Craig, by which it appears that the committees who brought in Abercromby and Jeffrey had met, and come to an almost unanimous resolution to support me, giving as reasons my independence, and character, and talents, etc.

Charles Wood called and read me several letters all concurring in the same view, and stating that Sir John Hobhouse was the popular man, and

that he alone gave the Whig party a chance of success, against the Tories who would start some one, and the Radicals who had started Mr. Ayton. But mention was made of the necessity of my going down, and of the questions which would be put to me about "Corn Laws, Short Parliaments, and Ballot." I told Wood that I had made up my mind before he came, but that this confirmed me. I would neither canvass nor pledge. I could only say to the Edinburgh electors what I had said to the Marylebone and others: if I am chosen I will do my duty, but I will not personally interfere. 1834.

After Wood went away the Lord Advocate came, but I remained firm. Jeffrey smiled and said I was not like the bounty of Heaven, to be won by prayers; and then in a very melancholy tone told me they did not know to whom to apply. I was the only man. "So much the worse for Scotland," said I.

On a review of what I have done, I feel sure I am right. If I come back to Parliament it must be on my own terms, otherwise I should be of no use.

May 16.—I wrote a letter declining to be nominated for Edinburgh, and putting my refusal on the true ground which I had stated to John Murray—namely, a dislike to canvass and make declarations for the sake of votes, as inconsistent with my former practice and my future free agency. I had some difficulty in wording

1834. this letter, as the resolutions said nothing either of canvassing or pledging, so that I was obliged to refer to my private information, which indeed was decisive enough as to the indispensable necessity of personal intercourse, canvassing, and speechifying, in order to gain the election.

I think that so far as personal interest is concerned I may have done wrong ; so far as character and public duty are to be consulted I have done right. I should have carried the election easily if I had chosen to adopt the usual means—I mean the cajolery of talking over the good citizens, and making what Murray in his letter called a *good strong Liberal speech*—such, for example, as his own to the Leith people, in which he boasted of having voted against Ministers on the Pension question, for which boast had I been Lord Grey I would have stopped his appointment.

May 27.—Mr. Plumer Ward brought on a motion that the revenues of the Church in Ireland exceeded its wants, and that Parliament may deal with the surplus. This motion brought the differences in the Cabinet to an issue. After Mr. Grote had seconded the resolution, Althorp rose and said that, whilst Mr. Grote was speaking, he had received a communication which made it expedient to adjourn the debate and the House until the following Monday. He could not then tell them what that communication had been ; but he threw himself upon the generosity of the House, whose confidence he had never abused.

This was received with tremendous cheering, and the House adjourned. 1834.

The next post brought the news of the resignation of Stanley and Graham, shortly followed by that of the Duke of Richmond and Lord Ripon.

May 29.—I called on Lord Durham, and found him in a superlatively sulky humour. He told me that nothing was yet finally resolved upon, but that up to this moment the intention was, if possible, to patch together the pieces of the broken Cabinet, by shifting and shuffling, and that neither he nor any decided Liberals were to be taken into the Government; most of the papers strongly recommending the introduction of him into the Cabinet, for, said Lord Durham, "it is useless to mince matters; I am the only man the country looks to."

Lord Durham told me that he believes Lord Lansdowne and Lord Holland would have broken up the Government had they not been assured that the new Cabinet should be remodelled upon the same principles as the last, and composed pretty much of the same quiet men. He (Durham) had seen Lord Grey that morning. He would not go on without Lord Lansdowne and Lord Holland, but Lord Durham did not think him in reality more inclined to be Liberal than they were, for he had *carte blanche* to do what he pleased and to fill up all vacancies with any men he liked. This confidence is personal to Lord Grey, and

1834. has no reference to politics. In that respect the King is as conservative as anybody.

The *Globe* of the evening stated that Spring Rice was to be Colonial Secretary and Ellice in the Cabinet. Lord Durham thought it probable. On the whole I was exceedingly surprised at all he told me. I think him wrong as to his own claims and merits, but I think him right as to the probable result of the arrangement being satisfactory to no one. His predictions as to Brougham's future pre-eminence I know not what to think of, nor am I quite of his mind as to the impossibility of forming a Tory Government. One thing is clear, that Lord Durham when I last spoke to him was decidedly of opinion that if there should be a split in the Cabinet he would inevitably be applied to. He was wrong there, and may be now.

I went to Brooks's, and had a great many flattering hopes expressed that I should be included in the new arrangements.

May 30.—The *Chronicle* mentions the new appointments. Spring Rice is to be Secretary of State, Ellice is to be in the Cabinet, Lord Auckland First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Carlisle Privy Seal, Lord Mulgrave talked of for the Post Office.

At Brooks's there was great discontent; some thought the whole a juggle, and that Government would after all do nothing effective respecting the Irish Church. Lord Sefton, who is generally

supposed to be employed as a sort of feeler for Brougham, spoke to me in rather a discontented tone, but Fazakerly, "the simmering saucepan" of Lansdowne House, approved of the new arrangements. Ellice's appointment staggered many. Sir G. Philips asked me if I thought Lord Grey knew Ellice's previous City history. I am not astonished, and my knowledge of that history prevents me from being so. 1834.

I sat with my friend Dr. Chambers, recovering from his accident. He told me that Dr. Thorpe, the Calvinist preacher, had got hold of Graham and persuaded him that he would go to hell if he consented to touch the revenues of the Irish Church.

I hear the Duke of Richmond said if he had come from Paris three days sooner he might have prevented the rupture, but that as he did not, he was bound in honour to follow Stanley and Graham.

May 31.—Dine at Methuen's: a strange party to meet the Lord Chancellor: Lord Durham, T. Duncombe, little Stanley, young Tynte, Sterling of the *Times*, Poulett Thomson. The party was talked of at Brooks's. It was easy to foresee Brougham would not come, nor did he, but sent an excuse—illness, a lie. Lord Durham said he was quite right, and if Brougham had come he would have stayed away. We had Radical politics.

After dinner I had a long talk with Poulett

1834. Thomson. Agreed as to new arrangements. By the way he is now President of the Board of Trade; said it was impossible things could go on; Ellice ruined by his elevation, cannot cajole and lie now that he is in the Cabinet. He threw Durham over, but Poulett Thomson objected to Durham's extreme vanity and pretensions. He told me that he had had no communication with any member of the Government on subject of new arrangements since Wednesday last. He spoke of Lord Grey as all but imbecile, said that Lord Lansdowne in effect was Minister, but he agreed that the new Government ought to have a fair trial and be judged by their heads.

June 2.—Debate in House of Commons on Ward's resolutions. The previous question was moved, and a Committee of Inquiry into the revenues of the Irish Church was promised. This manœuvre succeeded, though Stanley made a violent, and, I think, unhandsome speech; and Peel treated Ministers with contempt. Yet they and theirs all voted against the resolutions, and Ward had only 124 in his minority. Spring Rice, Palmerston, and Ellice made pitiful figures. There was little to explain as to secession. The retiring Ministers would not agree to the Commission, and went out. Althorp and Russell spoke of them most handsomely and almost wept. Stanley began in the tender style, but ended in a high Church tone, and said he knew the King would never sanction the alienation

of Irish Church property. I hear he was tremendously cheered, yet so was Althorp the other day when he announced in reality Stanley's retirement from office. The numbers were 396 against 124. 1834.

June 3.—Campbell and J. Murray returned for Edinburgh and Leith; my substitute by a large majority, more than 500. The Radical strength much overrated, and amounted to about 500. I see that Campbell called himself *honest John Campbell*, and that his speeches were altogether such as I would not have made.

June 4.—I had a curious conversation at Brooks's with Lord Tavistock. He told me that his brother John had actually proposed to the Cabinet a Registration Bill similar to that of W. Brougham; that Brougham had decried it and stopped it, and the Marriage Bill was substituted against Russell's will; that afterwards Brougham's brother brought in the Bill, and received the support of Government. Russell was charged by the Dissenters of Devonshire of taking their money to carry his election and betraying them, on which he determined to make the truth known, and he has written a letter to them. Althorp has made a declaration in the House of Commons which absolves him from secrecy. Lord Tavistock told me he had that morning a conversation with Lord Holland as to making Byng a Peer, to make way for me in Middlesex. Lord Holland thought it very

1834. desirable, but added, "Why not make Hobhouse a Peer?" I laughed at this, and said my use and place were in the other House.

The rumour as to Byng is very current. I had a long talk with him on the subject, and find he is nothing loth. As for myself I cannot say I much care about the matter, though I feel out of water at times. Burdett told me he now regretted very much I had not gone to Devizes. Perhaps that is to be regretted for my sake, at least.

People talked this day of the Government going out. The Tories do not seem eager; they are content with abuse.

June 6.—Debate in the Lords on changes. Lord Grey spoke well about the feeling of the country respecting the Irish Church, and he was right in telling the Tories to turn him out at once or to refrain from factious complaint. The Archbishop of Canterbury, and even the Bishop of London, declared strongly against the Commission.

June 20.—I had a long letter from Edward Ellice telling me that he had been offered the Admiralty at the last change, also that he went into the Cabinet with the perfect concurrence of all those before members of it, even the Chancellor, who had not spoken six words to him for six months.

He announced a *cut* between him and Lord Durham, and I told him my mind freely as to

the treatment I had met with : public ingratitude and private neglect, the former beginning to be less manifest ; whether my *soi-disant* friends would ever make amends for the latter remained to be proved. 1834.

June 22.—I had a long talk with Ellice. He told me that there must be a break-up in the autumn, and probably the King might send for the Duke of Wellington and Peel. They might try, and their Administration could not attempt to meet Parliament without a dissolution ; a dissolution would do them no good, and they would go out ; after which, good-bye to the House of Lords !

He told me the particulars of his quarrel with Lord Durham. Lord Durham suspected Ellice of writing articles in the *Courier* and *Globe* against him. He remonstrated, and Ellice assured him the articles did not proceed from him. Then came a most abusive article in the *Times* against Ellice, making use of phrases which Ellice had dropped in private conversation with Lord Durham, and so fastening the authorship on Durham. On this Ellice wrote to Durham telling him what he thought, and severing political intercourse with him. Durham met him and cut him. Certain notes had since passed between Lady Durham and Ellice, but such was the quarrel as it stood. Ellice was very angry. He told me that Lord Durham had offered to Lord Grey to go out of the way or

1834. to do anything to facilitate his arrangements when Stanley, etc., should leave him; and Lord Grey, when Stanley did go, offered the embassy of Paris to Lord Durham, who rejected it, Ellice said with disdain; and thence all the mischief and abuse of the new Cabinet. It was hinted that the Paris embassy would be a step to the Foreign Office, as Palmerston would not remain long, but Durham persevered in his refusal. As we were talking up came C. Wood and young Stanley, whom Ellice suspects of having forwarded Durham's grumblings to the *Times*.

I dined with the Alexanders. P. Stewart was there, and said to me privately, "You must be Chancellor of the Exchequer." Perhaps Ellice has put this about, but the admission of Abercromby into the Cabinet, in preference of me on the pretext of my not being in Parliament, convinces me that so long as Althorp is in power I shall not be. And perhaps it is better so. I doubt my capacity, and the responsibility is awful.

June 23.—I went to Lord Durham's, and had a very long conversation with him. Just as I was going away he talked of his rupture with Ellice. I told him my mind freely. He showed me Ellice's letter, who certainly had not qualified his cessation of intercourse by the word "political." He spoke in terms of the greatest indignation of the attack on Ellice in the *Times*, and altogether convinced me that he was very sorry for the

cut. I did all I could to restore the peace, and at last he said, "Well, what shall I do? I will do anything you tell me; I will put myself in your hands; I will give you *carte blanche*." 1834.

I went away and wrote a letter to Ellice urging the expediency of making up this more than civil war, telling him Durham had given me *carte blanche*, and asking him what were his terms.

June 24.—A letter from Ellice telling me he would shake hands with Lord Durham, and enclosing one from Lady Grey very piteously begging him to be reconciled with her son-in-law, for the sake of her daughter. I called on Lord Durham. He at first was a little restive, but at last seemed glad of the prospect, provided they were to be good friends as before. I was assured by Ellice such was his intention, and left him as he was going across the way to shake hands.

June 25.—There is a report Peel is willing to undertake the Government, and has said so at a great Conservative meeting; but others deny it, and say he used quite different language. Again, as Henry IV. said, "How is history written!"

June 27.—D.N. Forty-eight. Sunshine and showers with thirty tons of cut grass in the meadow. Typical of my own, the ordinary lot, on which the recurrence of this day naturally induces me to reflect.

1834. FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

July 3.—A scene occurred in the House of Commons which led to very serious consequences. The principal actors in it were Littleton, the Irish Secretary, and O'Connell. These gentlemen contradicted each other repeatedly "upon their honour as gentlemen."

It appears Littleton told O'Connell the Irish Coercion Bill was to be renewed without the most severe clauses, and that Lord Wellesley and himself were against these clauses; adding he told him this as a great secret, in order to induce him to mitigate his opposition to the Government. Accordingly O'Connell withdrew his Repeal candidate from the County of Wexford. He afterwards heard the Coercion Bill was to be renewed much as before, and he told the secret because he said he had been tricked and deceived.

Whatever might be thought of this public altercation, there could not be two opinions of the imprudence of Littleton; and Lord Grey, commenting upon the transaction, used strong language, and said he was no party to it and had no cognisance of it. Stanley, on this occasion, made use of an expression which "told" against his former colleagues, and showed that he was now their most formidable opponent. He compared them to the "thimble-rigging cheats of the racecourse," and said they' were robbers of Church property.

July 6.—The Irish Secretary tendered his resignation to-day, but Lord Althorp defended him and would not accept it, saying he was too valuable a man to lose. 1834.

July 7.—There was a debate on the Irish Coercion Bill, after which Lord Althorp himself resigned. He said the disclosures made by Littleton took the ground from under him, and that he could not go on with the Coercion Bill. Lord Grey sent Althorp's resignation to the King, and at the same time sent in his own resignation.

Poor Littleton made the most humiliating avowal; confessed that he had committed two great errors—communicating with O'Connell without the privity of Lord Grey, and trusting to a man who was not trustworthy. He concluded by protesting that he had acted from good motives, and was much cheered as he sat down.

Lord Grey's speech, on announcing his resignation, was most powerful and affecting. I could not resist the pleasure of writing to him, and telling him what I thought of it.

July 10.—In this confusion the most notable occurrence was that, in the Commons, Lord Althorp announced that the Administration was at an end; and, in the Lords, Lord Brougham declared positively that the Administration was not at an end; for no one had resigned, except Lord Althorp and Lord Grey, and he himself certainly had not resigned.

1834. The Duke of Wellington made a most savage speech in the Lords, against Lord Grey, for comparing the state of the country now with that in which the Duke left it in 1830. He accused the Whigs of having spilt more blood than any men.

July 14.—It soon became known that the King wished to form a Coalition Administration, including Peel, Stanley, and the Duke of Wellington; but that Lord Melbourne had been sent for, and informed His Majesty that such a Government was not practicable. On this Lord Durham sent me a message, through my brother, to say that a strong Liberal Government would be formed, and that I had better come up to London and be in the way.

July 15.—I had a letter from Lord Tavistock informing me that Lord Althorp had consented to remain Chancellor of the Exchequer under Lord Melbourne, and that Lord Grey had given his sanction to the arrangement. Lord Althorp's consent had been decided by an address, signed by 210 Members of Parliament, presented to him by Hume and O'Connell. Lord Tavistock added, "Althorp is miserable."

July 16.—I had a short note from Lord Tavistock, saying he hoped I would come up to London immediately. I accordingly went to London with my wife, and, walking down towards Spring Gardens, met Edward Ellice, who told me the King's messenger had gone down to Basildon, with

a letter from Lord Melbourne, offering me the Woods and Forests and a seat in the Cabinet. 1834. Ellice told me that Lord Duncannon was to be Home Secretary, with a peerage. No other changes were to be made.

I went to Lord Althorp. He laughed, as we shook hands, and asked me what I said to the proposal. I then told him that I was inclined to accept the offer; but that I thought I could have been of more use in Ireland, with Lord Durham as Lord Lieutenant, to which I knew that Lord Durham would have consented. Althorp urged objections personal to Lord Durham, which I endeavoured to overrule, but in vain.

FROM DIARY.

Walking home from Lord Althorp's I met Lord Tavistock and took him to Berkeley Square. He told me a good deal of what I knew before. The King had tried to get Stanley, the Duke of Wellington, and Peel to join Lord Melbourne and his friends. Lord Melbourne had written an admirable letter showing the impracticability of it; so did Stanley. The Duke and Peel merely acknowledged the communication, and said no more. The King then gave Melbourne *carte blanche* without restriction of persons. Melbourne resolved to have the old Cabinet, but Lord Althorp was indispensable. Althorp asked two hours to consider, and after a most painful struggle consented. He then announced in the Commons the

1834. appointment of Lord Melbourne and his continuance in office, and adjourned the House until Thursday. Lord Althorp's refusal would have thrown the country into the hands of the Tories.

Dined at Brooks's. After dinner came the messenger who had gone to Basildon with Lord Melbourne's letter. The offer was couched in very handsome terms, saying that all those likely to be in the Government concurred in it.

I then went to Lord Melbourne and after some conversation accepted his offer of the Woods and Forests and a seat in the Cabinet. At taking leave he said to me, "God bless you, and thank you sincerely." I came home, and reflecting on what I had done, saw nothing to disapprove. I believed the Government the best which, under the circumstances, could be found, and could give no reason on public grounds for refusing to join it.

Personally, I think the offer creditable to me. No conditions, no insisting on my coming into Parliament. I believe I am the first man not in Parliament who ever had a Cabinet place offered to him.

My dear wife approved and was happy. I thank God that her health is visibly improved. That is my main consolation.

July 17.—I had a very confidential conversation with Lord Lansdowne. He was far from satisfied with the late changes, and told me that, if his retirement would not have broken up Lord Melbourne's Cabinet, he would have gone to

Bowood. He held such language in regard to more than one of his colleagues as induced me to think he would not remain long in the present Cabinet; and, as to Lord Durham, he told me plainly he would not sit in the Cabinet with him. He considered Lord Melbourne's Government only as a continuation of Lord Grey's. I said, "*Un Français de moins.*" "Exactly so," replied he. 1834.

FROM BOOK, "RECOLLECTIONS."

July 18.—I accepted an invitation to stand for Nottingham, and went there the same evening. I refused to canvass the electors, or to give any pledges; and in my address merely referred to my past life, and my resolution to do my duty, as I had always done.

July 19.—I heard that Mr. Eagle, a barrister, whom I knew at Cambridge, was to be started against me at Nottingham; but I had the satisfaction of hearing that, when the Ministerial changes were announced by Lord Althorp, in the House of Commons, on Thursday, the 17th, they were received with cheers.

July 28.—The nomination took place in the Exchange Rooms. A murderer was executed in the morning, and the crowd that attended that spectacle adjourned afterwards to our exhibition.

The clock struck twelve, and Mr. Eagle's proposer began his speech. He was not very rude; but the seconder, a Mr. Boothby, an iron-founder, made the most insolent attack that ever

1834. had been made even upon me, who had heard so much of that sort of eloquence. He accused me of every political crime—apostacy, baseness, love of place, love of money, cruelty, and what not—besides telling the meeting that my wife's sisters, whom he called my sisters, were pensioners on the public. All this I bore patiently, because obliged to bear it; only once or twice I said, "That is false." The fellow went on reading charges against me from the *True Sun*, and treating me as the worst of political delinquents. Neither Lord Ranccliffe, who proposed, nor Mr. Wakefield, who seconded me, was heard at all. I experienced the same treatment. I pulled out my watch, and said I would give them five minutes to become silent; this had no effect, and the Assessor then put the question to the electors. The great majority in the body of the hall was certainly for Eagle; on the hustings about two hundred hands were held up for me, and away we came. I was somewhat annoyed to find that, after my Westminster opponents had, apparently, repented of their injustice, I was the object of this blind hatred at Nottingham. A good deal, however, of the opposition was directed against the Corporation, who were my friends, and the friends of the Whig party.

The election lasted two days, and, at the close of the poll, I had a majority of 1,025. The decision was announced in silence, when the patriot Eagle exclaimed, "What, not a greasy

1834.

ruffian to throw up his hat?" He, the day before, had called my supporters "ragamuffins," and said that nine-tenths of them were drunk. I believe one-twentieth of them were so; and my impression then was, that, although the whole constituency was far inferior to that of Westminster, yet there were two or three hundred highly spirited, independent men, as intelligent and well-mannered as any to be found in the kingdom.

I left Nottingham the next day.

July 27.—I took my seat on the Treasury Bench in the House of Commons, and felt as if I had never been out of Parliament. I had many very warm greetings from friends on all sides; but the pleasantest was that which was said to me by Henry Warburton. He crossed the House, and, coming to me, said, "Don't you recollect that the last thing you said to me, before you left Parliament, was 'Honest man'?" I answered, "Yes; I do recollect it well." He rejoined, "That is what I say to you, now that we meet again."

July 30.—I began my Cabinet life under circumstances not at all encouraging; for Ministers were beaten in the Commons on the Irish Tithe Bill, by an amendment proposed by O'Connell—we were only 34 to 85—and some of our best friends, such as Lord Ebrington and Bonham Carter, voted against us. The Lords also chose to throw out our Bill for admitting Dissenters

1834. to the Universities. The majority was above 100, although Lord Melbourne and our Chancellor made very powerful speeches in support of it.

FROM DIARY.

July 31.—A Cabinet Council, all fifteen present. Methought the masters of the British Empire round a table looked and talked much like other men.

We deliberated on the change made by the vote of last night in the Commons, and, excepting Lord Lansdowne, no one seemed to care much about the matter. The Premier was decisive. Lansdowne is an Irish landlord, and Althorp told me that, whenever his pecuniary interests interfere, his opinion is sure to be swayed by them. I thought I saw an air of discontent about him, and told Althorp so. Althorp said that Lansdowne ought not to be there, but he would not go.

August 2.—Dined at the Chancellor's: a large party, chiefly official men. After dinner Brougham amused us by telling the events of the interregnum in May 1832, and what passed between him and the King. He said he had the King's consent in writing to make sixty or more peers, if necessary. I never heard a great man talk in this way; he seemed to forget that the King was still his master. Lord Albemarle and the Duke of Argyll and Abercromby stared, so did I.

The Chancellor received and took leave of

me this night most tenderly: "Mon cher collègue." He is or will be crazy, that's clear. 1834.

August 5.—Irish Tithe Bill read a third time, after a spirited debate. No division. There were not five out of 120 against us in the whole House. Will the Lords dare to throw out the Bill?

August 6.—I dined at Lord Ebrington's. Russell talked over Stanley and Graham very freely indeed. He praised the former as a frank, *funny* man. He told us that the day of Stanley's "thimble-rig" speech he saw him just come off a Tunbridge Wells coach. Stanley had a black on his eye; Russell remarked it. "Ay," said he, "I shall give you a black eye before the evening is over."

Russell said that Stanley was much disappointed to find his attack on Ministers so ill received in the House, and has been since ashamed of it. As to Graham, Russell spoke of him in very different language—good at his office, that is all.

August 9.—I attended the Ministerial fish-dinner for the first time, at Blackwall. There were thirty-seven of us present, and we had a good deal of clumsy merriment about the late changes. Attorney-General Campbell tried to be waggish about the Lord Chancellor's letter to Lord Wellesley. Poor Littleton sat opposite to him; the jokes were no laughing matter to him.

I took and carried back Abercromby, who seems a very excellent man. He spoke much in praise

1834. of Brougham, and said that the longer he was known the better he was liked.

Abercromby said that Brougham, in spite of his abuse of friends and enemies, was in the long run just to both.

August 10.—We had a Cabinet to consider the King's Speech. Lord Melbourne read his draft of it. Brougham proposed a few verbal alterations. Dining at Holland House, with the Duke of Devonshire, the Lord Chancellor, Tom Moore, and Dedel, the Dutch Minister, our conversation turned chiefly on the probable fate of our Irish Tithe Bill in the Lords. Would the Opposition in that House throw out the Bill?

August 11.—Attended discussion on Tithe Bill in the Lords. House very full; heard Brougham and part of Wellington, and Bishop of London. The first very amusing; the next *bitter bad*; the last temperate but decisive. He stated that the Irish clergy preferred the rejection of the measure. I, for the first time in my life, was on the throne at the division. Bill rejected by 67—less than expected.

August 12.—Ministers not at all dejected by last night, only anxious as to probable consequences in Ireland. I feel sure that Lord Melbourne is just the man for his great place.

August 13.—I had an audience of the King, who told me he had seen the Commander-in-Chief and Quartermaster-General before me, because he had little to say to them and much to me. Had a

long talk about Buckingham Palace, which he told me he had never seen. Said Duncannon had crotchets about it; that Sir John Sebright had told him the other day it was a *dog-hole*. He said he lived at Windsor to please the public, otherwise would have preferred Bushy Park. . . . He consented that part of Regent's Park should be opened for pedestrians.

August 15.—Went at one to St. James's. King held a Council—Ministers, Commander-in-Chief, Steward of Household, etc. Lord Lansdowne read some formal papers for approval. In one he called Duncannon Duncan, at which a great laugh from King and Council!!! H.M. was in great good humour, the dust still on his coat from his Windsor journey. Called P. Greville *his dear friend*. Melbourne then read the Royal Speech, and we separated in a hurry to change our clothes, and get to the House of Commons in time to hear it.

The King read the Speech well, but more feebly than usual, I thought.

I saw him return. The crowd received him in dead silence, and no hats were pulled off, except Littleton's and mine. Charles Ross, an ex-Lord of the Admiralty, remarked that in the days of his Tory friends all the crowd pulled off their hats. It was the fashion then to impute every change for the worse to the Reform Bill and the Reform Ministers.

TABLE OF ADMINISTRATIONS DURING THE

	<i>Prime Minister.</i>	<i>Chancellor of Exchequer.</i>	<i>Foreign Secretary.</i>	<i>Secretary-at-War.</i>
1812. June 9.	Earl of Liverpool.	N. Vansittart to 1823, retired; then F. J. Robinson.	M. of London- derry to 1822, died; then George Canning.	V ^t Palmerston.
1827. April 24.	G. Canning.	G. Canning.	Earl of Dudley.	V ^t Palmerston.
1827. Sept. 5.	L ^d Goderich.	J. C. Herries.	Earl of Dudley.	V ^t Palmerston.
1828. Jan. 25.	D. of Wellington.	H. Goulburn.	Earl of Dudley.	V ^t Palmerston, 1828; L ^d Har- dinge, 1828- 30; L ^d F. Leveson Gower, 1830.
1830. Nov. 22.	Earl Grey.	V ^t Althorp.	V ^t Palmerston.	C. W. Wynn. Sir H. Parnell. E. Ellice. Sir J. C. Hob- house, 1832- 1833.
1834. July 17.	V ^t Melbourne.	V ^t Althorp.	V ^t Palmerston.	E. Ellice.

PERIOD COVERED BY THESE VOLUMES

<i>Home Office.</i>	<i>Lord Chancellor.</i>	<i>Admiralty.</i>	<i>Chief Secretary for Ireland.</i>	<i>Board of Control.</i>
V ^r Sidmouth (H. Addington) till 1821, retired; then Sir R. Peel.	L ^d Eldon.	V ^r Melville.	D. of Richmond till 1813; Earl Whitworth 1813-17; Earl Talbot, 1817- 22; Marquis Wellesley, 1821-8.	E. of Bucking- hamshire, 1812-16; died. G. Canning, 1816-21, re- signed. H. Bathurst, 1821-2. C. W. Wynn, 1822-8.
Sturges Bourne.	L ^d Lyndhurst.	D. of Clarence.	M. Wellesley.	C. W. Wynn.
Marquis of Lansdowne.	L ^d Lyndhurst.	D. of Clarence.	M. Wellesley.	C. W. Wynn.
Sir R. Peel.	L ^d Lyndhurst.	D. of Clarence. V ^r Melville.	M. of Anglesey, 1828. D. of North- umberland, 1829-30.	V ^r Melville, 1828. Lord Ellen- borough, 1828-30.
V ^r Melbourne.	L ^d Brougham.	Sir J. Graham.	M. of Anglesey, 1829. M. Wellesley, 1829-33. Sir J. C. Hob- house, March and April, 1833.	C. Grant.
V ^r Duncannon.	L ^d Brougham.	E. of Auckland.	E. Littleton.	Lord Ellen- borough.

INDEX

- Abercromby, Mr., iv. 361
 Aberdoen, Lord, iii. 68, 272, 284, iv. 25
 A'Court (Minister at Madrid), iii. 178
 Adair, Robert, iv. 2
 Addison's "Freeholder," iii. 234
 Albemarle, Lord, Master of the Horse, iv. 108
 Alexander, Emperor of Russia, at Chelsea, Portsmouth, and Woolwich, iii. 27; and Napoleon in 1814, iii. 143
 Algiers, captured by the French (1830), iv. 39
 Alien Act, the, iii. 131
 Allen, Mr., iv. 11
 Almack's, iii. 201
 Althorp, Lord, iii. 32, 233, iv. 64; opposes additional pension for Duke of Clarence, iii. 169; unites the Whig Opposition, iv. 36; and Reform, iv. 75; the author's independence of, iv. 81; announces Reform measure (1831), iv. 82, 88; altercation with Peel, iv. 105 *et seq.*; his patience, iv. 123; offers the author the Secretaryship at War, iv. 166; on the creation of Peers, iv. 178 *et seq.*, 194, 195, 209; his repugnance to office, iv. 180, 189; his great influence, iv. 192; receives freedom of the City, iv. 247; on Irish Church Reform, iv. 283 *et seq.*; on the deadlock in the Cabinet (1833), iv. 295; and author's resignation of Irish Secretaryship, iv. 306; his attack on Shiel and other Irish Members, iv. 329
 Alvanley, Lord, iii. 10, 31, 112 (footnote), 272; at Boyle Farm, iii. 206
 American despatches unopened (1806), iv. 11
 Anglesey, Lord, becomes Master-General of the Ordnance, iii. 185; and the Duke of Wellington's reticence, iii. 222; Littleton's opinion of, iv. 331
 Antiquarian Society, iii. 13
 Arbuthnot, Mr., to be Chancellor of the Duchy (1828), iii. 272; iv. 37
 Arguelles (Spanish statesman), iii. 15, 178
 Army Estimates (1832), the author brings in the, iv. 182
 Army, proposed reductions, iv. 183, 185, 186, 193, 194, 265
 Army, proposed reforms, iv. 267, 274; new Pension Warrant, iv. 280, 282; abolition of sinecures, iv. 285, 289; reduction of garrison appointments, iv. 286 *et seq.*, 290; proposed Board to consolidate Civil Departments, iv. 328
 Asgill's life saved by the Queen of France, iii. 23
 Asiatic Society, iv. 275
 Athenæum Club, iii. 21
 Attenborough, Dr., iii. 69
 Attwood (of Birmingham), iv. 28, 191
 Auchmore (Loch Tay), iii. 26
 Auckland, 1st Lord, negotiates the Coalition, iii. 249
 Auckland, 2nd Lord, made First Lord of the Admiralty, iv. 344
 Badajoz, the slaughter at, iii. 82
 Baillie, Dr., on Wm. Pitt's last words, iii. 21
 Bank Act, the (1826), iii. 125
 Banks, Mr. W., iii. 92, 119, 125, 314, iv. 104, 120

- Banks, Mr. Henry, iii. 302, 304
 Baring, Mr. Alexander, iii. 190,
 iv. 90, 91, 104, 223, 225; on the
 failure of Wellington's attempt
 to form a Government (1832),
 iv. 228 *et seq.*
 Barnes, Mr., of the *Times*, iv. 111,
 261
 Barry, Byron's banker, iii. 50; his
 account of Byron at Genoa,
 iii. 151; Byron's letters to, iii.
 152 *et seq.*
 Bartolini, his bust of Byron, iii. 8
 Basildon Park, iv. 325
 Bathurst, Lord, iii. 117, iv. 13
 Bavaria, King Maximilian Joseph
 of, iii. 148
 Bayley, Miss, iv. 158
 Bear Club (Devizes), iii. 116
 Bedford, 6th Duke of, iii. 164
 Bedford, 7th Duke of, iii. 162; and
 Catholic question, iii. 169
 Beefsteak Club, iii. 104, 236
 Belgium, revolutionary struggle
 in (1830), iv. 54 *et seq.*, 79; de-
 nounced in King's Speech, iv.
 55 *et seq.*
 Belgrave, Lady Elizabeth, iii. 24
 Belgrave, Lord, iii. 133, 264
 Belhaven, Lord, iv. 100
 Bentinck, Lord William, iii. 208
 Bentinck, Lord George, iv. 162
 Beresford, Lord, appointed Lt.-
 General of the Ordnance, iii. 12
 Berri, Duchess of, iv. 119
 Berwick, governorship of, iv.
 290
 Best, Lord Chief Justice, iii. 219
 Bex (Rhône Valley), iii. 289
 Bickersteth, Mr. Henry (Lord
 Langdale), iii. 72, 207; Copley's
 opinion of, iii. 220; dislikes
 Brougham, iv. 270, 337
 Blandford, Lord, his Reform
 resolutions, iii. 322; his Bill
 (1830), iv. 9
 Board of Trade, debate on salary
 of President, iii. 129
 Bognor, iii. 139
 Borghese, Prince, iii. 208
 Boswell, Sir A., iii. 128
 Bourbons, prospects of the (1822),
 iii. 9; support of the, iii. 17
 Boyd Alexander, Mrs. (author's
 sister), iii. 40, 281, iv. 13
 Boyle Farm, Fête at, iii. 206
 Brancalone, Contessa (author's
 sister), iii. 40, 291
 Brenton, Mr., and Byron, iii. 153
 Brighton, iv. 48
 British Museum, iii. 20
 Brodie, Sir Benjamin, iv. 122
 Brougham, H. (Lord), iii. 28; un-
 popular, iii. 32; on Reform, iii.
 51; on education, iii. 85; on
 Catholic Relief, iii. 97, 260; at
 the Beefsteak Club, iii. 104,
 236; on religion, iii. 114; on
 J. Hume, iii. 159; prepares his
 speeches, iii. 177; his diary,
 iii. 223; his vagaries, iii. 232;
 on law reform, iii. 241; Lord
 Holland's recollections of, iii.
 252; on Huskisson's resignation,
 iii. 276; on the Wellington
 Government, iv. 3, 7; on news-
 paper reporters, iv. 6; and the
 Duke of York's debts, iv. 7;
 scene with Peel, iv. 35; his Re-
 form motion, iv. 60; becomes
 Lord Chancellor, iv. 71, 72, 73,
 74; on the Reform Bill (1831),
 iv. 82; on Lord Chancellor's
 salary, iv. 85; makes mischief,
 iv. 93; congratulates the author
 on taking office, iv. 170; Lord
 Durham's opinion of, iv. 257;
 Macaulay's opinion of, iv. 327;
 and Bickersteth, iv. 337; his
 wife's assembly, iv. 338; on the
 interregnum of May 1832, iv.
 360
 Buckingham, Duke of, iii. 210,
 iv. 39
 Buckingham, James Silk, iv. 46
 Buckingham Palace, iii. 20, iv.
 363
 Budget of 1831, iv. 84, 86
 Buonaparte, Lucien, iv. 316
 Buonaparte, Napoleon, advised by
 Lallemand not to go on board
 the *Northumberland*, iii. 16;
 O'Meara's Memoir, iii. 17; *Les*
Casas "Memorial of St. Helena,"
 iii. 18; Lavalette on, iii. 141 *et*
seq.; as a Captain at Toulon in
 1793, iii. 155; and Flahaut, iii.
 164; Bourienne's Memoirs, iv.
 17
 Buonarrotti, Cosimo, iii. 295
 Burdett, Sir F., iii. 18, 19, 22, 37;
 at Byron's funeral, iii. 68; and
 the Catholic petition, iii. 85;
 and the Catholic Bill, iii. 93, 97;
 anecdote of Fox and Sheridan,
 iii. 121; on Byron Monument

- Committee, iii. 125; returned for Westminster with the author (1826), iii. 137; on Canning's speech on the new world, iii. 160; and the Catholic question, iii. 170, 173; supports Canning, iii. 186, 191; begs the Duke of Devonshire to do the same, iii. 198; question of peerage for, iii. 208, 209; on the Navarino debate, iii. 242; and the Westminster election (1830), iv. 29, 30, 44; on the French revolution of 1830, iv. 46; on the state of the country (1830), iv. 74; Westminster election (1831), iv. 109; and the "National Union," iv. 147, 151; on the author's resignations, iv. 307, 319; negotiates between Grey and O'Connell, iv. 339
- Burke, Rt. Hon. E., iii. 14; Lord Carnarvon's anecdotes of, iii. 104 *et seq.*
- Byron, Capt. George, iii. 35 *et seq.*, 347, iv. 237
- Byron, Lady, iii. 39, 347
- Byron, Lord, at Pisa, iii. 2 *et seq.*; and the Carbonari, iii. 3, 6; at Ravenna, iii. 4; and Scott, iii. 7; Bartolini's bust of, iii. 8; his friendship for Moore, iii. 15; and the cause of Greece, iii. 33; details of death of, iii. 35 *et seq.*, 53, 57 *et seq.*, iv. 20; the *Times* on, iii. 41; his genius for friendship, *ibid.*; the saviour of Greece, iii. 43; Sir F. Adam's testimony, *ibid.*; his will, iii. 47, 49, 65; and Sheridan, iii. 48; Hanson's anecdotes of, iii. 50; his body reaches England in the *Florida*, iii. 56, 64, 66 *et seq.*; his regret at having written "Cain" and "Don Juan," iii. 59; his career in Greece, iii. 60 *et seq.*; his funeral, iii. 68 *et seq.*; his letters and MSS. lodged at Kinnaird's Bank, iii. 114; Moore's Life of, iii. 124, 134 *et seq.*, 206, 227; monument to, *ibid.*; his home at Genoa, iii. 151; his letters to Barry, *ibid.*; to Leigh Hunt, iii. 193; to Lady Melbourne, iii. 173, 227; monument to, iii. 255, 277, 279, iv. 2; destruction of his Memoirs, iii. 327 *et seq.*; Pietro Gamba's account of the last illness of, iii. 365 *et seq.*; sale of his copyrights, iv. 9; the separation controversy, iv. 17
- Byron, Miss Ada, iv. 330, 367
- Byron, Mrs. (Lord Byron's mother) iii. 49
- Cadiz, taken by French (1823), iii. 28
- Calcraft, Mr. John (M.P.), iv. 130 (note)
- Campbell (Attorney-General), iv. 361
- Campbell, Sir Colin (1828), iii. 255
- Campbell, Thos. (the poet), iv. 17, 23, 157
- Campbell (the sculptor), iv. 321
- Canning, Charles (afterwards Lord), iii. 181
- Canning, Mr., iii. 11, 12, 13; as a young man, iii. 251; on wars between France and Spain (1823), iii. 16; compared with Castle-reagh, iii. 17; on supporting the Bourbons, iii. 17, 18; in debate, iii. 21; smuggling of his embroidered coat, iii. 30; unpopularity of, iii. 32; on Wellesley and Hastings, iii. 44; and the Foreign Office, iii. 49; and the Catholic Association debate, iii. 87; and the Catholic Relief Bill, iii. 96, 114; his policy in the Cabinet on the same, iii. 104; on the dread of innovation, iii. 127; on Portuguese affairs and the "new world," iii. 159; illness of, iii. 168, 177; his Corn Law plan, iii. 173; "Toby-Phillpott" speech, iii. 175; his personality, iii. 179; becomes Prime Minister, iii. 183; on the Catholic question, iii. 188; attacks on his family, iii. 189, 194, 213; opposed to Reform, iii. 191; brings in his Budget, iii. 199; author declines invitation to dine with, iii. 205, 209; his last illness, iii. 212; his death, iii. 214; character of, iii. 215, 217, 239; his funeral, iii. 218; the pension to his family, iii. 261
- Canning, Mrs., created a Viscountess, iii. 236

- Canning, Stratford, on Turkey, iii. 253
- Canova, his death, iii. 9; his interviews with Napoleon, iii. 122
- Canterbury, Archbishop of, against Irish Church Commission, iv. 348
- Carbonari, the, iii. 3, 4
- Cardington, iii. 18
- Carlisle, Lord, iii. 68, 207, 210, iv. 344
- Carnarvon, Lord, iii. 104, 136
- Castlereagh, iii. 17, 204. See also Londonderry
- Catholic Associations, debates (1825), iii. 35 *et seq.*, 91; (1829), iii. 301, 303 *et seq.*; dissolution of the, iii. 305
- Catholic Emancipation, iii. 169, 173 *et seq.*, 260, 278
- Catholic Relief Bill of 1825, drafted by O'Connell, iii. 96; debate on, *ibid.* *et seq.*; third reading, iii. 98; debate in House of Lords, iii. 99
- Catholic Relief Bill of 1829, iii. 301 *et seq.*; passes the Commons, iii. 314; debate in the Lords, iii. 315; bill passed, iii. 316; receives Royal assent, iii. 318; Charles X.'s opinion on, iv. 51
- Cavendish, Lord George and Lord John, iii. 138
- Chambers, Dr., iv. 345
- Chantrey (the sculptor), iii. 230, iv. 126, 321
- Charlemont, Lady, iv. 100, 197
- Charles I., his orders for the arrest of Prince Rupert, iii. 13
- Charles X. in 1829, iii. 299; in 1830, iv. 5; deposed, iv. 43; at Lulworth, iv. 51
- Charlotte, Princess, iii. 163
- Chateaubriand, iii. 156, 292 *et seq.*
- Chelsea Hospital, King William IV. visits, iv. 245
- Chester, Bishop of (Blomfield), iii. 258
- Chesterfield, Lord, iii. 206
- Childe, Mr., moves the Address (1823), iii. 10
- Chillingham Castle, iii. 78
- Chisholme, iii. 77
- Chiswick House, Canning dies at, iii. 213
- Cholera, the, iv. 150, 160, 181, 216
- Churchill, Lord J. (Captain R.N.), iii. 46
- Cimitile, Prince, on Metternich, iii. 83, 140, 240
- Civil List debate (1831), iv. 98
- Clanricarde, Lady, iv. 315
- Clarence, Duke of, additional pension for, iii. 169; attends Canning's funeral, iii. 218; iv. 1. See also King William IV.
- Cleveland, Duke of, iv. 320
- Clive, Lord (afterwards 2nd Earl of Powis), iii. 301, iv. 155
- Cobbett, at the Westminster dinner, iii. 196; his wife, 197; his aversions, iv. 71
- Cochran, Lady, iii. 17
- Cochrane, Lord, iii. 115; and the Stock Exchange fraud, iii. 155; his account of the Greek Navy, iii. 243; at siege and battle of Athens, iii. 244
- Codrington, Admiral Sir Edward, iii. 238, 242, iv. 66
- Coke, T. (of Holkham), iii. 137, 138
- Combination Bill, the, iii. 111
- Corno, Lake of, iii. 150
- Congreve, Sir William, iii. 161
- Conolly, Mr. (M.P.), iv. 117
- Constance, Lake of, steamboat on, iii. 147
- Constant, Benjamin, iii. 9, iv. 47
- Constantine, Grand Duke, iii. 167
- Conyngham, Lady, iii. 13
- Conyngham, Lord F., iii. 13
- Conyngham, Marquis of, iv. 32
- Cooke, T. P. (the actor), iv. 161
- Cooper, Sir Astley, iv. 20
- Copley (Attorney-General), iii. 107, 111; Master of the Rolls, iii. 173; and the "Toby-Phillpott" speech, iii. 175; made Lord Chancellor, iii. 185, 203; on George IV., iii. 219; and Lord Brougham, iv. 73; defeats Lord Grey's Government on the Reform Bill (committal stage), iv. 218; his unyielding opposition, iv. 230
- Corn Laws, iii. 133, 134, 177; Duke of Wellington defeats Canning's Bill, iii. 202; Canning's resolutions, iii. 204
- Cornwall, Mr. (M.P.), anecdotes of Wellington, iii. 266 *et seq.*; disapproves of Wellington's opposing all Reform, iv. 58
- Cork, Lady, iii. 76, 137, iv. 38

- Corry, Lord, iii. 301
 CottlesHouse, home of the author's father, iii. 223
 Cotton Mills Regulation Bill, iii. 99; amended, iii. 321, 323
 Courtenay, Thomas Peregrine, iv. 83
 Coutts, Mrs., iii. 137; marries the Duke of St. Albans, iii. 203; iv. 22 (note)
 Cowper, Lord, iii. 104 *et seq.*, 182
 Cox, Rev. R., iii. 279
 Creation of Peers. See Peers.
 Creevey, iii. 30; his character, iii. 80, 93, 177
 Crewe, Lord (1823), iii. 22, 77
 Croker, J. W., iv. 154, 155, 193
 Cromwell, iii. 118
 Cumberland, Duke of, attends Reform debates (1831), iv. 103
 Cunningham, Allan, iv. 3
 Currency debate, iv. 301
 Cutlar Fergusson, Mr. R., iv. 210, 214
 Czartoryski, Prince, iv. 210, 215
 Dacre, Lady, iii. 281
 Dacre, Lord, iii. 231, iv. 111
 Dallas, Mr., and Byron's letters, iii. 72
 Damer, Mrs., iii. 15
 Darnstadt, its opera and Grand Duke, iii. 146
 Davenport, Mr. (M.P.), iii. 22
 David (the painter), tomb of, iii. 157
 Davy, Dr., iii. 119, iv. 111
 Davy, Lady, iv. 101, 315
 De Dunstanville, Lord, iii. 52
 Delaunay Memoirs, iv. 152
 Denman, Chief Justice, iv. 317
 Derby Day at Epsom (1825), iii. 101; dead-heat (1828), iii. 269
 De Roos, Henry, iii. 206
 Despatches, stories of unopened, iv. 11
 De Staël, Madame, iii. 24
 Destruction of Lord Byron's Memoirs, iii. 329 *et seq.*
 De Veau, Mr., iv. 167, 307, 311, 312
 Devereux, Mr., on the Canonical Sabbath, iii. 259
 Devonshire, Duke of, iii. 167; banquet given by, iii. 207
 D'Israeli (the elder), iii. 92; his "Essay on the Literary Character," iii. 266
 "Divisions of Purley," the, iii. 131
 Doherty (Solicitor-General) on O'Connell, iv. 8
 Dom Pedro, of Portugal, iv. 118 (note), 121
 "Don Juan," Cantos X., XI., XII., iii. 274; sale of copyright, iv. 9
 Dover, Lord, and the Horse Guards clock, iv. 277
 Doyle, Colonel, iii. 337
 Drummond, Mr. Henry, iii. 90
 Dudley, Lord, iii. 132, 177; becomes Foreign Secretary, iii. 191; on the Greek question (1827), iii. 220
 Duel between Wellington and Winchelsea, iii. 313
 Duke of York's School, iv. 244
 Duncan, Admiral (Lord Camperdown), iv. 14
 Duncannon, Lord, iii. 203, 260
 Dundas, his pension, iv. 13
 Durham, Lord, iv. 59; becomes Lord Privy Seal, iv. 71; offers of office to the author, iv. 92; on the prospects of the Reform Bill (Feb. 1832), iv. 170; on the proposal to create Peers, iv. 176 *et seq.*, 197; and the King, iv. 199; and Bishop Phillpotts, iv. 212; his opinion of the Emperor Nicholas, iv. 255; on Lord Grey and his colleagues, iv. 256 *et seq.*; on Brougham, *ibid.*; on the author, iv. 257; differences with Lord Grey about Stanley, iv. 260 *et seq.*, 279; mission to Paris, iv. 338; quarrel with Ellice, iv. 349 *et seq.*
 East Retford disfranchisement, iii. 269
 Eaton, author visits Lord Grosvenor at, iii. 24
 Ebrington, Lady, iii. 133
 Ebrington, Lord, iv. 135; his address to the Crown, iv. 222; attack on Wellington, iv. 225
 Edinburgh, the author declines to stand for, iv. 339 *et seq.*
 Elcho, Lady, iii. 19
 Elcho, Lord, iii. 18
 Eldon, Lord Chancellor, on Unitarian Marriage Bill, iii. 32; on the Bishops and the Catholic Association Bill, iii. 100; not in the Wellington Cabinet, iii. 239; on the Test Acts repeal, iii. 258; on Catholic Relief Bill, iii. 317, 318

- Ellenborough, Lord, iii. 189; history of his promotion by Wellington, iii. 240
- Ellice, Mr., iii. 74, 94, 119, 120, iv. 78, 109, 313; joins Lord Grey's Cabinet, iv. 344; his previous history, iv. 345; quarrel with Lord Durham, iv. 349 *et seq.*
- Epsom races, iii. 101, 269
- Erskine (Lord Chancellor) and George III., iii. 80
- Eugubian Tables, the, iii. 292
- Evans, Colonel, opposes the author at Westminster election, iv. 260, 310; is returned, *ibid.*
- Ewart, Mr., iv. 193
- Examiner*, the, iv. 247
- Eynard, Chevalier, iii. 199 *et seq.*
- Factory Act (1825), iii. 99; Bill to amend (1829), iii. 321, 323; (1831), iv. 104, 122, 134, 135
- Falloden, iii. 79
- Farnley, iii. 28
- Fawkes, Mr. (of Farnley), iii. 28
- Ferguson, of Pitfour, anecdotes of, iii. 224, 319
- Fitzclarence, Lord Frederick, iv. 250
- Fitzclarence, sinecure appointments for the family of, iv. 289 *et seq.*
- FitzGerald, Maurice, iv. 104
- Flahaut, iii. 164
- Fletcher, Byron's valet, iii. 35 *et seq.*, 56 *et seq.*, 65, iv. 371, 372
- Flogging in the Army, iii. 128, 177, iv. 197, 208, 246; abolished in the Swedish Army, iv. 288; Lord Hill's opposition, iv. 295
- Florence, iii. 295
- Florida*, the, brings Byron's remains home, iii. 58, 64
- Fonblanque, A. (editor of the *Examiner*), iv. 247
- Foremark (Sir F. Burdett's), iii. 217
- Foscolo on poetry, iii. 23; his career, iv. 15
- Fouché's Memoirs, iv. 145
- Fox, Rt. Hon. C., iii. 11; and Moore, iii. 12; and Sir — Mildmay, iii. 22; and Hastings, iii. 48; and George IV., iii. 138, 163; Lord Holland's anecdotes of, iii. 247 *et seq.*, iv. 332
- France, declares war against Spain (1822), iii. 10; state of (in Jan. 1830), iv. 5
- Francis, Philip, iii. 14
- Frankfort, defence of, iii. 145
- Fremantle, Jack, his account of the Prussians at Waterloo, iii. 267
- Fremantle, Treasurer of the Exchequer, iii. 218, iv. 14
- Frere, Bartholomew, iv. 19 (note)
- Frere, Hookham, iii. 129
- Fuller, Jack, anecdote of Sheridan, iii. 136
- Galiano (Spanish Minister), iii. 178
- Galt's Life of Byron, iv. 47, 53
- Gamba, Count Pietro, iii. 3, 35, 227; on Greece's debt to Byron, iii. 43; anecdotes of Byron in Greece, iii. 62 *et seq.*; his account of Byron's last illness, iii. 365 *et seq.*
- Garriick Club, iv. 181
- Gascoyne, General (M.P.), iv. 101, 308
- Gemmi Pass, iii. 289
- General Election (of 1831), iv. 122; (1832), iv. 264
- Genoa, iii. 297
- Geographical Society, founding of the, iv. 26, 64
- Gesner's monument, iii. 147
- Gibbon, at Lausanne, iii. 29
- Gifford, Lord, iii. 220
- Glasgow, steamboat service, iii. 25
- Gleig, Rev. G. R., appointed chaplain to Chelsea Hospital by Russell, iv. 333
- Glenorchy, Lord, iii. 26, 132
- Goderich, Lord, iii. 215; resigns, iii. 230, 232, 235, 241; at Literary Fund Dinner, iii. 263; on the scene in the House of Lords (1831), iv. 107; on proposed reductions in Army Estimates, iv. 186; causes a Cabinet crisis, iv. 296, 297, 298; resigns, iv. 343
- Gogel, Mr. (of Frankfort), iii. 145
- Gordon, Duchess of, iii. 224
- Gordon, Sir Willoughby, iv. 245
- Goulburn, Mr., iii. 85
- Graham, Sir B., iii. 18
- Graham, Sir James, iii. 75, 208, 283; speech on reduction of salaries, iv. 8, 20; against Treasurership of the Navy, iv. 12; alarmed by the revolution of 1830, iv. 59; First Lord of the Admiralty, iv. 71; on dissolving

- Parliament (1830), iv. 79; on defeat of Reform Bill (1831), iv. 103; on the author joining the Government, iv. 170; on arrears of Government business, iv. 253; Lord Durham's estimate of, iv. 257; melancholy, iv. 278; and the Irish Church Revenues Bill, iv. 340; resigns, iv. 343; Russell's opinion of, iv. 361
- Grant, Charles, iv. 18
- Grant, Sir Alexander Cray (M.P.), iv. 145
- Grant, Sir W., iii. 223
- Grantham, Lady, iii. 99
- Granville, Lord, iii. 99
- Grattan, Mr. H., iv. 292
- Greece, iii. 33, 200, 221
- Greek Committee, iii. 156
- Greek deputies, iii. 73, 115
- Greek Loan, iii. 73
- Greenock, iii. 25
- Granville, Lord, anecdotes of, iii. 52
- Gray, General (Henry), of Fallo-den, iii. 79
- Gray, Lord, on political outlook (1823), iii. 21; and George III., iii. 79; at home, iii. 81, 93, 95, 226; on Sheridan, iii. 128; dissatisfied with Canning, iii. 186, 189; and Sir R. Wilson, iii. 195; on the House of Lords, iii. 202; on Wellington and Catholic Emancipation, iii. 305, 318; on the Galway Franchise Bill, iv. 31; his strange character, *ibid.* (footnote); forms a Government, iv. 70 *et seq.*; on the King's support to Reform, iv. 94; on Poland, iv. 99; made K.G., iv. 113; introduces Reform Bill in the Lords, iv. 134; and Bishop Phillpotts, iv. 139; his character, iv. 150; on the duties of the Secretary-at-War, iv. 169; the proposed Creation of Peers, iv. 174 *et seq.*; Mansion House dinner to, iv. 182; on second reading of the third Reform Bill, iv. 207; his influence with the King, iv. 208; carries the third reading of the Bill in the Lords, iv. 214; defeated on committal, iv. 218; resignation of, iv. 219, 223 *et seq.*; resumes office, iv. 233; receives freedom of the City, iv. 247; on the personalities of his Cabinet colleagues, iv. 255; Lord Durham's opinion of, iv. 256; and the author's, iv. 263; on the King's sinecure appointments, iv. 290; tired of official life, iv. 296; attempts to dissuade the author from resigning, iv. 306; his seventieth birthday, iv. 332; on the Irish Church question, iv. 348; resigns, iv. 353
- Grosvenor, Lord (and Lady), iii. 24, 109
- Grosvenor, R., iii. 206, iv. 108
- Grote, Mr. G., iv. 342
- Gubbio, iii. 291
- Guiccioli, Madame, iii. 3
- Gurney, Mr. Hudson, iii. 126, iv. 19
- Hall, Capt. Basil, iv. 126
- Hallein, salt mine of, iii. 149
- Hamilton, Terriack, iv. 19
- Hanbury Tracy, iii. 53
- Hanson (Byron's solicitor), iii. 46, 49, 64, 286
- Hardinge, Sir Henry, iii. 270; on Reform, iv. 82, 89, 98, 124; on the dissolution, iv. 106; conveys a challenge from Peel to the author, iv. 110; on the action of the Lords, iv. 133; on the riots, iv. 142; on flogging in the Army, iv. 208; opposes the new Pension Warrant, iv. 288
- Harmer, Alderman, iv. 327
- Harrington, Lord, iii. 164, iv. 321
- Harrowby, Lord, iii. 230, iv. 134, 207
- Hartham House, Wilts, iii. 222
- Hawkins, Mr., maiden speech on Reform Bill, iv. 102
- Hay, Lady Julia, iii. 277, 280; engagement to the author, iii. 281, 284; marriage, iii. 285. See also Lady Julia Hobhouse
- Hay, Lord and Lady James, iv. 52
- Hay, Lord John (Capt. R.N.), iii. 26, 281
- Hay, Lord Thomas, iv. 311, 326
- Hazlitt, his animosity to Byron, iii. 153
- Heidelberg, iii. 1
- Herries, Mr., becomes Chancellor of the Exchequer, iii. 219; 241, 245, 246, iv. 96
- Hertford, Marquis of, on Canning's South American policy, iii. 53

- Heytesbury, Lord, iii. 259
- Hill, Lord (Commander-in-Chief), iv. 185, 194; friction with the author, iv. 247, 267; assents to author's new Pension Warrant, iv. 280; opposes abolition of flogging, iv. 295
- Hinde*, H.M.S., iii. 46
- "His Majesty's Opposition," origin of, iii. 129, 161, 191, iv. 21
- Hobhouse, Sir Benjamin (author's father), iv. 114, 122; his death, iv. 129, 140
- Hobhouse, Edward, iii. 1
- Hobhouse, Henry, in India, iii. 45; Under-Secretary at the Home Office, iii. 185; resigns, iii. 210; at Send Grove, iv. 16; candidate for Bath, iv. 253; beaten at election, iv. 264
- Hobhouse, Lady Julia, iii. 286, iv. 110; her illness, iv. 114, 129; at Hastings, iv. 157, 170; gets better, iv. 215, 265; at Send Grove, iv. 312; again ill, iv. 317; health improves, iv. 356
- Hobhouse, T. B. (author's half-brother), iii. 145, 233, iv. 264
- Hodgson, Provost of Eton, iii. 70
- Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd, iv. 203
- Holland, Dr., iii. 132
- Holland, Lady, iii. 15, 17, 90, 95, 198, 230, 240, 282, iv. 72, 204, 254, 336
- Holland, Lord, iii. 15; talks Spanish, iii. 19; his story of Pitt's duel with Tierney, iii. 31; the relief of the Catholics, iii. 91; his letters to Byron, iii. 95; on Thurlow, iii. 112; his character, iii. 118; on France, iii. 139; on Canning's Government, iii. 198; on the need of union among the Whigs, iii. 234; his anecdotes of George III., Lord North, Pitt, and Fox, iii. 247 *et seq.*, iv. 332; and Wellington, iv. 38; on Lord Grey's Government, iv. 72; on Reform, iv. 75; on the crisis (March 1832), iv. 204
- Horne, Attorney-General, iv. 277
- Horner, Leonard, iii. 229
- Horse Guards clock, the, iv. 276
- Hortense (ex-Queen), iv. 119
- Hotham, Admiral Sir William, iv. 13, 157; anecdotes of his family, iv. 159
- Houghton, visit to, iii. 120
- House and Window Tax, iv. 268, 271, 294, 305, 324
- House of Lords and Catholic Emancipation, iii. 100
- Howick, Lord, iii. 77, iv. 162
- Hucknall (Church), Byron's funeral at, iii. 70
- Hume, Mr. Joseph, iii. 11; on M. A. Carlyle's case, iii. 17; and Greek Loan, iii. 74; on Portuguese affairs, iii. 159, 201; his use of the word "liable," iii. 204, iv. 59; candidate for Westminster, iv. 28 *et seq.*, 46; and the Civil List (1831), iv. 98; Lord Rector of Glasgow University, iv. 150; on the Army Estimates, iv. 182; his letters opened at Foreign Courts, iv. 201; and Brazilian aggressions, iv. 215; on flogging in the Army, iv. 246; proposes Littleton for Speaker, iv. 279; on naval and military sinecures, iv. 285; opposes Irish Coercion Bill, iv. 293; economical advice to the Duke of Kent, iv. 314
- Hunt, Mr., iv. 83; on Reform Bill, iv. 89; on flogging in the Army, iv. 208
- Huskisson, Rt. Hon. W., iii. 95, 127, 168, 177, 265; on Peel, iii. 193; anecdotes of Mr. Pitt, iii. 203; his health, iii. 216; and Lord Lansdowne, iii. 233; in Wellington's Administration, iii. 237, 241, 254; his change of opinion on the Corn Question, iii. 257; his vote on the East Retford Bill, iii. 271; his resignation, iii. 271, 275, 276; votes for Lord J. Russell's Reform proposal (1830), iv. 10; accident to and death of, iv. 49; author's opinion of, iv. 50
- Hutchinson's Memoirs, iii. 118
- Inglis, Sir Robert, iii. 75, 212; on Catholic Emancipation, iii. 302, 309; on Reform, iv. 80, 88
- Irish Church Reform, iv. 283, 292, 324
- Irish Coercion Bill (1833), iv. 292, 352 *et seq.*
- Irish Secretaryship, accepted by the author, iv. 297; author's

- interview with the King about, iv. 299; author enters on the, *ibid.*; the small establishment in Queen Street, iv. 300; author resigns, iv. 305; Mr. E. J. Littleton succeeds to the, iv. 331
- Irish Tithe Bill, iv. 359, 361; in the Lords, iv. 362
- Jeffrey, Mr. (afterwards Lord), iv. 90 (note), 338, 341
- Jekyll, iii. 182
- Jersey, Lady, iii. 101, iv. 76; and the Reform riots, iv. 143 (note)
- Jersey, Lord, made Lord Chamberlain, iv. 39
- Jewish Disabilities Bill (1830), iv. 16, 22
- John Bull* newspaper, on the author's resignation of his office and seat, iv. 312
- Jones, Sir William, iii. 120; his death-bed, iii. 122
- Junius, authorship of, Letters of, iii. 116
- Kemble, Miss Fanny, iv. 14; as Juliet, iv. 23
- Kenmare, Lady, iv. 197
- Kennedy, Mrs., iv. 80
- Kent, Duchess of, iv. 205, 314, 337
- Kerrison, General, iii. 270
- King George III. and Lord Grey, iii. 80; his reputed speech about Catholic Emancipation not a fact, iii. 205; Lord North's recollections of, iii. 250; Sir W. Hotham's anecdote of, iv. 160
- King George IV. at Brighton, iii. 13; quick at quoting Latin, iii. 52; and Fox, iii. 138, 163; and Sheridan, iii. 165; opens Parliament (1826), iii. 158; letter to the Duke of Wellington, iii. 199; and his Tory Ministers, iii. 203; on Cabinet changes (1827), iii. 218; offers the Duke of Wellington the command-in-chief, iii. 222; sends for him to form a Government, iii. 235, 240; at the Drawing-room, iii. 258; and the Catholic Question, iii. 270, 317, 320; and the Duke of Wellington, iii. 321, 323; and the Duke of York's debts, iv. 7; his illness, iv. 18, 20; his death, iv. 31; funeral, iv. 39
- King, Lord, iii. 136
- King, Mr. (and Mrs.), iii. 31
- King William IV., accession of, iv. 32 *et seq.*; holds a Levee, iv. 40; reviews the Guards, *ibid.*; reviews troops in Hyde Park, iv. 42; at Brighton, iv. 49; his visit to the City postponed, iv. 62; alarm in the City, *ibid.*; dissolves Parliament (April 1831), iv. 105 *et seq.*; the author's high opinion of, iv. 116; opens new London Bridge, iv. 125 *et seq.*; and the author's father, iv. 140, 171; wishes the author appointed Secretary-at-War, iv. 169; holds a Council, iv. 172; the creation of Peers, iv. 181, 209; and Lord Durham, iv. 199; refuses to make Peers, iv. 219; accepts Lord Grey's resignation, iv. 220; sends for Wellington, iv. 223; the author has an audience of resignation with, iv. 224; Baring on the King's action, iv. 228, 229; struck by a stone at Ascot, iv. 243; waning popularity, iv. 251; assents to new Pension Warrant, iv. 281; his prescription for the gout, iv. 282; on sinecure appointments, iv. 289; on the author's resigning the Irish Secretaryship, iv. 308; holds a Council at St. James's, iv. 363
- Kinnaird, Lord, iii. 109, 206
- Kinnaird, Mr. D., iii. 37 *et seq.*; and Byron's will, iii. 47 *et seq.*; at Boyle Farm fête, iii. 206; at Southill, iii. 231; and the destruction of Lord Byron's Memoirs, iii. 329 *et seq.*; his death, iv. 12
- Kinsale, governorship of, iv. 290
- Kleinthal, the, and Gesner's monument, iii. 147
- Knight, Mr., bookseller, iii. 72
- Knighton, Sir William, iii. 213
- Lafayette, iii. 9, 299, iv. 47, 78
- La Harpe, iii. 278
- Lallemand, General, iii. 16
- Lamb, George, iv. 328
- Lamb, Lady Caroline, iii. 43, 82
- Lamb, William, iii. 280
- Lambton, iii. 44, 45, 208; created Lord Durham, iii. 236, 245. See also Durham, Lord

- Lambton Castle, iii. 28; racing party at, iii. 81
- Lansdowne, 1st Lord, iii. 168, 185; joins Canning's Cabinet, iii. 194, 210; on the Bishops' action in the House of Lords, iii. 200, 258; his capabilities, iii. 207, 229, 232; out of office, iii. 247; the Byron Memoirs, iii. 362; on the scene in the House of Lords (April 1831), iv. 108; tries to dissuade the author from resigning, iv. 307; on Lord Melbourne's Cabinet, iv. 356; and the Irish Tithes Bill division, iv. 360
- Lascelles, Lord, iii. 29
- Lauderdale, Lord, iii. 32, 281, 323, iv. 21, 39; supports Wellington, iii. 322; duel with General Arnold, iv. 95
- Lavalette, Count, iii. 140; on Napoleon and Talleyrand, iii. 141 *et seq.*
- Lawrence, Thos. (artist), iv. 23
- Leeds, Duke of, iii. 207
- Leigh, Hon. Mrs. (Byron's sister), iii. 35 *et seq.*, 44, 53, 66; and the Byron Memoirs, iii. 333 *et seq.*; Count Gamba's letter to, iii. 365 *et seq.*
- Leigh Hunt, iii. 2; and Byron, iii. 153, 239
- Leinster, Duchess of, iii. 168
- Leopold, Prince of Orange, iv. 25, 79; becomes King of the Belgians, iv. 118
- Lethbridge, Sir Thomas, iii. 180, 181
- Levee, the King's, author attends as a Minister, iv. 184, 185
- Leveson-Gower, Lord, iii. 319
- Lieven, Princess, iii. 264
- Lindsay, Lady Charlotte, iii. 31, iv. 333 (note)
- Liston in *Paul Pry*, iii. 121
- Literary Fund, iii. 241; Dinners (1828), 263; (1832), iv. 216, 285
- Littleton, E. J. (Lord Hatherton), iv. 323; on the Irish, iv. 331; on Lords Anglesey and Wellesley, *ibid.*; his scene with O'Connell, iv. 352; he resigns, iv. 353
- Liverpool, Lord, iii. 10, 102; on Corn Question, iii. 133; illness of, iii. 169, 177, 179, 233; his indolence, iii. 182, 204
- London, Bishop of, iv. 348
- London Bridge, iii. 109; opening of, iii. 125
- Londonderry, Charles 3rd Marquis of, his duel with Battier, iii. 31, 82
- Londonderry, Marchioness of, iii. 82
- Londonderry, Marquis of, his suicide, iii. 1
- Louis Philippe becomes King of the French, iv. 45, 47, 53
- Lulworth, Charles X. at, iv. 51
- Luttrell, Mr., and Lord Byron's Memoirs, iii. 328 *et seq.*, iv. 321
- Lyndhurst, Lady, iii. 252, 253
- Lyndhurst, Lord. See Copley
- Lytton Bulwer (M.P.), iv. 285
- Macaulay, on Reform Bill (1831), iv. 89, 119, 125, 138; attacks Peel, iv. 155; difficulty of his position, iv. 276; going to India, iv. 326; on Brougham and Stanley, iv. 327
- Macdonald, Sir James, iv. 165
- Mackintosh, his "*vindiciae gallicae*," iii. 14; Creevey's opinion of, iii. 30; at the Board of Control, iii. 194; in Catholic Relief debate, iii. 311; on the abolition of capital punishment, iv. 27; on Reform Bill, iv. 119; his death, iv. 237
- Mahon, Lord, iv. 124
- Maitland, Lord, iv. 168
- Malcolm, Sir John, iv. 275
- Malt Tax, defeat of Lord Grey's Government on, iv. 301
- Manchester, Duke of, iii. 127
- Manners Sutton, again chosen Speaker (1826), iii. 158, 204; Reform row in the House, iv. 104, 105 *et seq.*; his farewell, iv. 249; re-elected in reformed Parliament, iv. 279
- Mansfield, Lord, attacks Canning, iii. 189
- Marriage of the author, iii. 284, 286
- Mars, Mlle., iii. 281
- Marsden, William (Oriental traveller), iii. 307
- Matthews, C. S., iii. 29, 35, 69
- Mavrocordato, Prince, and Byron, iii. 62, 371, 373
- Maximilian Joseph (King of Bavaria), iii. 148

- Medwin's "Conversations" (with Byron), iii. 83, 359; his character, iii. 166
- Mehemet Ali, iv. 275
- Melbourne, Lord, iv. 147, 245, 277, 334; becomes Premier, iv. 355; offers the author a seat in the Cabinet, iv. 356; his draft of King's Speech, iv. 362, 363
- Melton, Club Dinner, iii. 18
- Mendel, Rabbi, tries to re-convert Wolff, iii. 172
- Methuen, Paul, iv. 317, 319, 345
- Meyrick, Dr., iii. 117
- Miguel, Dom, iii. 240
- Milan, iii. 1, 290
- Miles, Mr. John (late Coldstream Guards), iii. 82
- Millingen (Byron's doctor), iii. 58, 64, 371, 372
- Milton, Lord, iii. 246
- Ministerial Fish-dinner, iv. 361
- Mirabeau, iv. 216; Dumont's "Souvenirs," iv. 336
- Missolonghi, fall of, iii. 128; position of, iii. 368
- Mitford's "Alexander the Great," iii. 237
- Molyneux, Lord, iii. 18
- Monckton, Mr., iv. 38
- Mont Cenis, passage of the, iii. 298
- Montholon, and Napoleon's will, iii. 85
- Moore, T., his opinion of Hobhouse, iii. 8; at Melton, iii. 18; at Mr. Ord's, iii. 32; on Byron's death, iii. 40; on publishing his *Memoirs of Byron*, iii. 84, 134, 227; his letters to Byron in 1822, iii. 152; all are returned to him by the author, iii. 206, 227; differences with the author, iii. 247, 323; and the destruction of Lord Byron's *Memoirs*, iii. 329 *et seq.*; his *Life of Byron* published, iv. 5, 81
- Morning Chronicle*, the, iii. 242, iv. 137
- Morning Journal*, prosecution of the editor, iv. 4
- Morpeth, Lord, iii. 68; on Catholic Emancipation, iii. 173
- Mulgrave, Lord, iv. 11, 280
- Munich, iii. 148
- Munster, Lord, on opinion at the Court about Reform, iv. 183; his indiscreet interference, iv. 236
- Murat, Achille, iv. 118
- Murray, Mr., on Byron's death, iii. 39; on publishing a volume of Byron letters, iii. 51; prevents an attack on Byron by Southey in the *Quarterly*, iii. 84; his house party in Whitehall Place, iii. 92; asks author to write a *Life of Byron*, iii. 116; offers Moore 4,000 guineas for a *Life of Byron*, iii. 239; introduces author to Sir Walter Scott, iii. 256; author lends him Saunders's portrait of Byron, iii. 323; and the destruction of Lord Byron's *Memoirs*, iv. 329 *et seq.*; sends the author Moore's *Life of Byron*, iv. 4; pays Moore £6,000, iv. 81
- Murray, General Sir George (M.P.), iii. 272, 309, iv. 11, 57, 120
- Musgrave, Sir James, iii. 18
- Mutiny Bill, the, iv. 208, 295
- Nahmuk Pasha, iv. 271; his account of Turkey, iv. 273, 274
- Napier, Sir Charles, iii. 225
- Napier, Sir George, iii. 224
- Napier, Sir William, iii. 224; Wellington and Soult assist him in his "History," iii. 225
- Naples, iii. 294
- Napoleon. See Buonaparte
- Navarino, "an untoward event," iii. 221; it saved Greece, iii. 226; "an unexpected collision," iii. 238; author's speech in debate on, iii. 242 *et seq.*
- Necker, during the attack on Versailles, iii. 24
- Nelson, Lord, Sir William Hotham's anecdotes of, iv. 157, 252
- Neston Park, iii. 223
- Newcastle, Duke of (1779), iv. 11
- Newstead Abbey, iii. 29
- Ney, tomb of, iii. 156
- Nicholas, Emperor, iii. 167; on the Revolution of July, iv. 66; on criticism of him by Parliament, iv. 252
- Norfolk, Duke of, iv. 41
- Normanby, Lord, iii. 245, 280
- North, Lord, Lord Holland's recollections of, iii. 249
- Norton, Hon. Mrs., iv. 27
- Nottingham Castle, burning of (1831), iv. 139

- Nottingham, the author elected for (1834), iv. 358
- Nugent, Lord, on George III.'s reputed speech on Catholic Emancipation, iii. 205
- O'Connell, Daniel, iii. 94, 170; Clare election, iii. 283; attempts to take his seat, iii. 320; his maiden speech, iv. 8; dines with the Speaker, iv. 9; his extreme views, iv. 23; on Wellington, iv. 25; at the Westminster dinner, iv. 244; as agitator, iv. 281; supports Irish Church Reform scheme, iv. 284; opposes Irish Coercion Bill, iv. 292; friendship with Lord Duncannon, iv. 303; his Repeal motion (1834), iv. 336; would like to join Lord Grey's Government, iv. 339; his quarrel with Littleton, iv. 352
- O'Gorman Mahon, iv. 83
- Opposition, His Majesty's, iii. 130
- Orange, Prince of. See Leopold Ord, Mr., iii. 31, iv. 334
- Orleans, Duke of. See Louis Philippe
- Orleans House, Twickenham, iv. 323
- Ouvrard, Napoleon's contractor, iii. 31
- Oxford, Bishop of (1829), speaks in favour of the Catholic Relief Bill, iii. 317; the King cuts him, iii. 322
- Paganini, iv. 121
- Palmer, Mr. Arthur, iv. 329
- Palmerston, Lord, on Navarino, iii. 238; leaves the Wellington Government, iii. 271; on the political outlook (Feb. 1829), iii. 300; speech on Catholic Relief Bill, iii. 311; and Brougham's Reform motion, iv. 60; on Lord J. Russell's Bill, iv. 90; apathetic, iv. 96; on the Belgian question, iv. 164; on the crisis, iv. 198; invested with the Order of the Bath, iv. 241
- Papplewick, iii. 69
- Parliament, meeting of (1823), iii. 10; reform of, see "Reform"; difficulty of speaking the truth in, iii. 262; dissolution of (1830), iv. 42; (1831), iv. 103, 104 *et seq.*; scene in the House of Lords, iv. 107; opening of (June 1831), iv. 115; King prologues (1832), iv. 250; meeting of the new reformed, iv. 278
- Parnell, Sir Henry, iv. 66; Secretary-at-War, iv. 98; dismissed, iv. 165; desires Chancellorship of the Exchequer, iv. 196; Durham's estimate of, iv. 257
- Parr, Dr., iii. 84
- Parry, Dr. Charles, iii. 223
- Passport, author applies for a, iii. 286
- Paternoster, Mr., author of "Byronicus," iii. 282
- Paul Pry, origin of, iii. 241
- Paulet, Lord William, iii. 280
- Peel, Mr. Jonathan, iii. 303
- Peel, Mr. (afterwards Sir) Robert, speech in honour of James Watt, iii. 52; iii. 90; and cotton-factory children, iii. 95; and the Larceny Bill, iii. 170; on Catholic Emancipation, iii. 174, 260; with the King, iii. 177; resigns on Canning's promotion (1827), iii. 183; his reasons, iii. 188; supports Canning's Corn Bill, iii. 204; difference with Lord Milton, iii. 246; on Huskisson's resignation, iii. 276; adopts Catholic Emancipation, iii. 302; his contest at Oxford, iii. 305; his speech on Catholic Relief Bill, iii. 308; his cold manner, iv. 25; succeeds to the baronetcy, iv. 22; scene with Brougham, iv. 35; announces resignation of Wellington Ministry, iv. 68; on the alarming state of the country, iv. 73; and of France, iv. 78; on Lord J. Russell's Reform motion, iv. 88, 90; speech on third reading, iv. 102; on the dissolution of Parliament, iv. 106; sends challenge to the author, iv. 111; on the new Parliament, iv. 115; on second Reform Bill, iv. 117; on the third Bill, iv. 155; reply to Macaulay's attack, iv. 156; the Ettrick Shepherd and, iv. 204; on Lord Ebrington's motion, iv. 222; refuses to join Wellington, iv. 228
- Peers, proposed creation of, iv. 144, 173, 174 *et seq.*, 181, 209, 219

- Peninsular War, Napier's History of, iii. 225
 Penn, W., iv. 1
 Perceval, Spencer, iv. 79, 83
 Père la Chaise, Cemetery, iii. 156
 Phillpotts, Bishop (of Exeter), iv. 139, 212
 Pisa, iii. 2, 296
 Pitt, Right Hon. Wm., iii. 11; his last words, iii. 21; duel with Tierney, iii. 31; thanks Brougham for his "Colonial Policy," iii. 223; Lord Holland's anecdotes of, iii. 248; Sir William Hotham's anecdotes, iv. 158
 Place, Francis, iii. 229, iv. 164, 227
 Planta, Mr., iii. 203, 265, iv. 103
 Plunkett, Lord, iii. 194
 Poland, Lord Grey on, iv. 99; Prince Czartoryski on, iv. 210
 Polidori, iii. 69
 Polignac, iv. 47, 78
 Poole, author of *Paul Pry*, iii. 241
 Poor Law Bill (1834), iv. 338
 Pope's Correspondence, iii. 221
 Porchester, Lord, iii. 105; his maiden speech, iv. 119; opposes third Reform Bill, iv. 155
 Portugal, King John of, iii. 52
 Poulett Thomson (afterwards Lord Sydenham), iii. 193, iv. 330 (note); on Lord Grey's colleagues, iv. 331; President of the Board of Trade, iv. 348
 Pozzo di Borgo, iv. 2, 275; anecdotes of Napoleon, iv. 278
 Privy Council, meeting of the, iv. 171
 Prussia, King of, at Portsmouth, iii. 27
 Queen Adelaide, iv. 125 *et seq.*, 243; unpopular, *ibid.*, 250, 315
 Queen Caroline, her death-bed, iii. 45
 Queen of France (Marie Antoinette), saves Asgill's life, iii. 23; during the attack on Versailles, iii. 24
 Quorn, a run with the, iii. 18, 30
 Railway, Liverpool and Manchester, opened, iv. 49
 Raneliffe, Lord, iii. 69, 359, iv. 358
 Reform, Parliamentary, Fox's speech, iii. 129; author's speech on (1826), iii. 132, 322; Lord Blandford's Bill (1830), iv. 9; Lord J. Russell's proposal (1830), iv. 10; the author's advanced views, iv. 24; Wellington declares against, iv. 56, 58; Lords Stafford and Talbot declare for, iv. 59; Lord Tavistock's and Lord Holland's views, iv. 75; Lord John Russell introduces the Bill (1831), iv. 87; debate on, iv. 88 *et seq.*; the King in favour of, iv. 94; debate on second reading of Bill, iv. 96, 97; views of tradesmen on, iv. 100; Bill defeated on third reading, iv. 103; Fund established to assist, iv. 109; Reform Dinner in the City, iv. 112; second Reform Bill introduced, iv. 117; author's speech on Metropolitan representation, iv. 127; new Bill read a third time, iv. 131; debate in the Lords, iv. 134; thrown out by the Lords, iv. 136; action of the populace, iv. 139, 140; proposed creation of Peers, iv. 144, 209; third bill introduced (Dec. 1831), iv. 154; additional Members for London, iv. 187; the Bill carried in the Lords, iv. 213; defeated on committal, iv. 218; Lord Grey's Government resigns, iv. 219; Wellington's proposal to carry Reform, iv. 224 *et seq.*; he gives it up, iv. 226; Lord Grey returns to office after receiving guarantees, iv. 233; the Bill going through Committee, iv. 235; the Bill passed, iv. 240; receives the Royal Assent, iv. 242
 Regency question (1830), iv. 37
 Repeal of the Union, iv. 336
 Revolution of July (1830) in Paris, iv. 43 *et seq.*, 52, 54
 Ricardo, Mr., iii. 1; his death, iii. 26
 Richmond, Duke of, iv. 343, 345
 Riding Establishment at St. John's Wood, iv. 184; to be moved to Maidstone, iv. 202
 Riots in the country, iv. 139
 Rogers, Sam, iii. 15, 182; letter to Byron in 1818, iii. 152

- Rome, the author in, iii. 8, 292;
Canova's studio in, *ibid.*
- Ross, Charles, ex-Lord of the Admiralty, iv. 363
- Rosslyn, Lord, made Privy Seal, iii. 322, 324
- Royal Society, the, iv. 74
- Russell, Lord, iii. 162, 163, 207
- Russell, Lord John, iii. 17, 122, 123, 128; his Reform motion (1826), iii. 132; fracas with Lady Holland, iii. 230; his Reform proposals of 1830, iv. 10, 24; to bring forward the Reform Bill (1831), iv. 82; his speech, iv. 87; presented with the freedom of the City, iv. 121; brings forward third Reform Bill (Dec. 1831), iv. 154; prospects of carrying it in the Lords, iv. 210; a Commissioner of Chelsea Hospital, iv. 245; appoints Gleig to the chaplaincy there, iv. 333; and the Irish Church Bill, iv. 340; on Stanley and Graham, iv. 361
- Russo-Belgian Loan, iv. 248
- Sackville, Lord George, iii. 116
- Sainsbury, Dr., iii. 116
- St. Albans, Duke of, marries Mrs. Coutts, iii. 203, iv. 22
- St. Antonio, Countess, iii. 255
- St. Aulaire's History of the Fronde, iii. 226
- St. James's Palace, Children's Ball at, iv. 315
- St. Lorenzo, Duke (and Duchess) of, iii. 19; on Spain and France, iii. 20
- Salaries, official, reduction of, iv. 8, 20, 84
- Saldanha, Count, and the Terceira case, iv. 18 (note)
- Salzburg, iii. 149
- San Marino, Republic of, iii. 291
- San Marsano, Marquis, iii. 28
- Scarlett, Sir J., iii. 86
- Schlegel, iii. 145
- Scotland, steamboats on West Coast of, iii. 25
- Scott, Sir Walter, letter to Byron announcing death of the two Boswells, iii. 152; on the Duke of York, iii. 161; Flahaut's opinion of, iii. 165; author's meeting with, iii. 157; Murray introduces author to him, iii. 256; his conversation with Byron about his religion, *ibid.*; his last romances, iv. 160
- Scrope Davies, iii. 69
- Sebright, Sir J., iv. 20; seconds Reform motion, iv. 88
- Secretaryship at War, offered to author, iv. 165 *et seq.*; Lord Grey on duties of the office, iv. 169; author's proposed changes, iv. 270, 276; at variance with the Commander-in-Chief, iv. 247, 267, 287, 295; the author leaves the War Office, iv. 297
- Send Grove, iv. 16, 113
- Seymour, Lord, iii. 260; marriage to Miss Sheridan, iv. 27
- Shée, Sir G., iv. 312
- Shelley, iii. 2, 69
- Shelley, Sir John, iii. 203
- Sheridan, iii. 23; and Byron, iii. 48; and the Duchess of Devonshire, iii. 76; his failings, iii. 107, 123; Moore's Life of, iii. 121, 123; his conduct to the Whigs, iii. 128; and to the Duke of York, iii. 136; Mrs. Fitzherbert's opinion of, iii. 165; and Lady Holland, iv. 159
- Sibthorp, Colonel (M.P.), iv. 117
- Sidmouth, Lord, iv. 264
- Simond, Louis, iii. 288
- Sinecures, abolition of, iv. 285, 289
- Slavery Question, iii. 135, iv. 269
- Smith, Rev. Sydney, iii. 102, 263; on the belief in a second life, iv. 26, 100
- Smith, Sir Sidney, iv. 42
- Smuggling by King's messengers, iii. 30
- Somerset, Duke of, iii. 211, 229
- Somerset, Lord Fitzroy, iv. 185
- Somerville case, the, iv. 246, 250
- Soult, Marshal, assists Napier in his "History," iii. 225
- Southey, his attack on Byron, iii. 84
- Southill, iii. 230
- Spain, France declares war against (1822), iii. 10; Duke of St. Lorenzo's opinion, iii. 20
- Speaker, the (Manners Sutton), iii. 158, 204, iv. 104, 105 *et seq.*, 174
- Spencer, Lord Robert, iii. 106, iv. 39

- Spencer, William, his stories of Pitt and Fox, iii. 11, 12; of Burke and Sheridan, iii. 14
- Stuttgart, iii. 1
- Spring Rice, iii. 189, iv. 336, 344 "S.S.B.S." See Beefsteak Club
- Stanhope, Fitzroy, anecdotes of the Duke of Wellington, iii. 162
- Stanhope, Lady Hester, iii. 172
- Stanhope, Col. Leicester (friend of Byron), iii. 33, 42, 46, 56; his account of Byron's career in Greece, iii. 60 *et seq.*; and Greek Committee, iii. 156
- Stanley, Mr. (afterwards Lord), iv. 77; on Reform, iv. 91, 93; on Ireland, iv. 151; attacks Croker, iv. 156; on Church Reform, iv. 255; Lord Durham's opinion of, iv. 257; Macaulay's opinion of, iv. 327; resigns, iv. 343; attacks his former colleagues, iv. 352; Russell's opinion of, iv. 361
- Steamboats, iii. 25; on Lake of Constance (1826), iii. 147
- Stewart, Villiers, iii. 173
- Stormont, Lord, iv. 117
- Stowell, Lord (Sir William Scott), iii. 182
- Stuart Wortley on the Canning pension, iii. 261
- Sturges Bourne, Mr., iii. 185, 186, 188, 210, 211, 246, 265
- Sussex, Duke of, iii. 93, 140, 218, 278; Ranger of Windsor Park, iv. 40; at the Garrick Club, iv. 181; on the creation of Peers, iv. 184; and the Bristol petition, iv. 234, 236
- Swinburne, Sir John, iv. 216
- Talleyrand, iii. 142; his knowledge of mankind, iii. 192; at the opening of Parliament (1830), iv. 60; at the Mansion House, iv. 182
- Talma, tomb of, iii. 157
- Tankerville, Lord, iii. 78
- Tavistock, Lord, iii. 18, 132, 233, 270, iv. 70, 321; and George IV., iii. 163; at Oakley, iii. 166; at Devonshire House, iii. 207; views on Reform, iv. 75, 90; on Registration Bill, iv. 347
- Taylor, Michael Angelo, iii. 177
- Taylor, Sir Brook (Minister at Munich), iii. 148
- Taylor, Sir Herbert, iv. 177, 184, 290
- Tenterden, Lord, iii. 220, iv. 135
- Terceira case, the, iv. 18
- Test and Corporation Acts Repeal, iii. 258, 278
- Thurlow, Lord, iii. 113
- Tierney, his duel with Pitt, iii. 32; says Whigs not pledged to Reform, *ibid.*; on the Catholic Associations, iii. 86; on Sheridan, *ibid.*; on "His Majesty's Opposition," iii. 130, 161, 191; anecdote of Hotham, iii. 139; becomes Master of the Mint, 194; his death, iv. 6
- Tighe, Mrs., iii. 15
- Timber duties, iv. 93
- Times, The*, iii. 243; "Byronicus" attacks the author in, iii. 279; and the destruction of Lord Byron's Memoirs, iii. 350, 352 *et seq.*; against the prosecution of the editor of the *Morning Journal*, iv. 4; on Huskisson's death, iv. 50; on Lords throwing out Reform, iv. 137; the editor on Lord Durham, iv. 261; on the author's resignation of his office and seat, iv. 308; and the quarrel between Durham and Ellice, iv. 349 *et seq.*
- Titchfield, Lord, death of, iii. 30
- Tooke, Horne, iii. 131
- Townshend (Lord Lieutenant of Ireland), anecdotes of, iv. 217
- Trades Unions' procession to the Home Office, iv. 334
- Trelawny, Mr., iii. 46
- Trotter (Lord Provost), iii. 128
- Tullamore, Lady, iv. 101
- Turner, General, iii. 26
- Turner, the painter, iii. 28, 295
- Tweeddale, Lord, iii. 281, 288; and the Duke of Wellington, iv. 2; and his Government, iv. 11; on the state of Paris (1830), iv. 53
- Twickenham Meadows, iii. 112, iv. 252
- Twisleden, Mrs., iii. 109
- Twiss, Horace, iv. 18, 38
- Tyrrwhit, Sir Thos. (Black Rod), iii. 52
- Ulysses, General, iii. 47
- United Service Institution in augurated, iv. 192

- Vandeweyer, Mr., iv. 57, 65, 79
 Vansittart, made a Peer, iii. 11
 Vernon, Harcourt, iv. 120
 Verona, Congress of, iii. 9
 Vestry Bill (the author's), iii. 320,
 iv. 14, 15, 22, 40, 75, 86, 133,
 134, 135, 144; becomes law,
 145
 Victoria, Princess (afterwards
 Queen Victoria), iv. 206
 Villa Diodati, iii. 287
 "Vivian Grey," iii. 135
 Vyvyan, Sir R., iv. 103, 104
- Wakefield, Mr., iv. 358
 Walewski, Count, iv. 99
 Wall, Mr. Baring, iv. 87
 Wallensee lake, the, iii. 148
 War Office business, iv. 253; dis-
 cord with the Horse Guards, iv.
 287; Committee inquires into,
 iv. 318
 War Secretaryship, offer of, iv.
 165 *et seq.*
 Warburton, Mr. (M.P.), iv. 29,
 359
 Ward, Mr. Plumer, iv. 342
 Warren, Dr., iv. 317
 Washington, G., iii. 23
 Waterloo, some truths about, iii.
 267; Simond's story about, iii.
 288
 Webster, Lady, iii. 247
Weekly Dispatch, The, iv. 327
 Wellesley, Lady, iii. 247
 Wellesley, Lord, iv. 331
 Wellington, Duke of, on the losses
 at Badajoz, iii. 82; on Lord
 Liverpool's indolence, iii. 182;
 disagreement with Canning, iii.
 184; his financial ability, iii.
 190; his mission to St. Peters-
 burg (1826), iii. 220 (note); ex-
 ample of his reticence, iii. 222;
 helps Napier in his "History,"
 iii. 225; sent for to form a
 Government, iii. 235; his in-
 clusion of Huskisson, iii. 237,
 241; and Ellenborough, iii. 240;
 nearly wrecked on voyage to
 Portugal, iii. 255; author meets
 him at dinner, iii. 264; fre-
 quent changes in his Cabinet,
 iii. 273; his opinion of the
 author, iii. 285; and the Catholic
 Relief Bill, iii. 310, 315, 316;
 his duel with Lord Winchilsea,
 iii. 313; falls off his horse, iii.
 321; Lord Holland's criticism
 of, 322, iv. 38; and Lord Grey,
ibid.; on the French revolu-
 tion of 1830, iv. 44; at opening
 of Liverpool and Manchester
 railway, iv. 49; declares against
 Reform, iv. 50; and the King's
 visit to the City, iv. 62; visits
 Mr. Vandeweyer, iv. 65; end of
 his Administration, iv. 69; his
 resistance to Reform, iv. 95,
 116, 134, 184, 207; his windows
 broken, iv. 141, 244; on flogging
 in the Army, iv. 197; at the
 Speaker's Levee, iv. 211; in
 favour of some reform, iv. 212;
 sent for to form Government
 (1832), iv. 223; proposes to
 carry Reform, iv. 224 *et seq.*;
 failure, iv. 226; his explana-
 tion, iv. 230; for Irish Church
 Reform, iv. 324; on the Thirty-
 Nine Articles, iv. 333
 Westmacott, iii. 15
 Westminster, author elected for
 (1826), iii. 137; re-elected 1830,
 iv. 29; 1831, iv. 109; on accept-
 ing office, iv. 172; Colonel Evans
 to oppose the author, iv. 260;
 re-elected (1832), iv. 264; re-
 signs on the question of House
 and Window Tax, iv. 305; stands
 again and is defeated by Col.
 Evans, iv. 310
 Westminster Abbey roof on fire,
 iii. 308
 Westminster Dinners, iv. 113,
 244
 Wetherell, Sir Charles (Attorney-
 General), on Catholic Relief
 Bill, iii. 311; on Reform Bill,
 iv. 89; on Reform riots, iv. 141
 Wharcliffe, Lord, iv. 104; op-
 poses Reform Bill, iv. 134; on
 the riots, iv. 142; decides to
 vote for the Bill, iv. 207
 Wherry (*Chargé d'affaires* at Dres-
 den), iii. 49
 Whigs, need of union among the,
 iii. 234
 Whitbread, Mr. S., iii. 118, 122,
 161, iv. 28
 White, Miss Lydia, iii. 102
 Whitebait Dinner, Ministerial, iv.
 361
 Whitton Park, iii. 45, 76 *et seq.*,
 209, 227, 280
 Wilberforce, iii. 17, 204

- Wilbraham, Roger, iii. 22, 125, 126, 244
 Wildman, Colonel (of Newstead), iii. 70, iv. 162
 Wilkie, David, iv. 13
 Wilkins, Mr. (of the Asiatic Club), iii. 48, 143
 Williams, Mr. John (M.P.), iii. 51, 72
 Wilmot Horton, iii. 265, 333
 Wilson, Sir Robert, iii. 115; his conduct to Lord Grey, iii. 195; on Canning's illness, iii. 213; on the Navarino debate, iii. 242; restored to his rank, iv. 40; speech on Reform Bill, iv. 102
 Wimbledon, Lambton's villa at, iii. 45; Duke of Somerset at, iii. 211, 229
 Winchelsea, Lord, attacks Canning, iii. 189; on Catholic Relief, iii. 312; his duel with Wellington, iii. 313
 Windham, W., iii. 126, 138; as Colonial Secretary, iii. 307; at Westminster Abbey fire, iii. 308; his despatches, iv. 11
 Windsor Castle, expenses of, iv. 85; King William on, iv. 363
 Winn, Mr. (M.P. for Malden), iii. 158
 Wolff, the missionary, iii. 171; and Lady Hester Stanhope, iii. 172
 Wood, Charles (afterwards Lord Halifax), iv. 144, 308, 327, 340
 Wood, Francis (M.P.), iii. 247
 Woods and Forests, the author becomes Minister for, iv. 356
 Woolaston, Dr., iii. 231
 Wrottesley, Sir J., iii. 125
 Wurtemberg, King of, iv. 41, 42
 York, Duke of, on the Catholic Bill (1823), iii. 10; visit to Woolwich with Emperor of Russia, iii. 27; on Catholic claims, iii. 96; his death, iii. 161; his debts, iv. 7
 Yorke, Sir Joseph, iii. 301
 Young, Col., secretary to Lord Hastings, iii. 45
 Zoological Gardens, the, iv. 323

PRINTED BY
HAZELL, WATSON AND VINCY, LD.,
LONDON AND AYLESBURY.

**PRESIDENT'S SECRETARIAT
LIBRARY.**



Accn. No......

1. Books may be retained for a period not exceeding fifteen days.